This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES
3 3433 07079197 9

CASE

OF THE

PROTESTANTS OF IRELAND

STATED.

CASE

OF THE

PROTESTANTS OF IRELAND

STATED.

13916

CASE

OF THE

PROTESTANTS OF IRELAND,

STATED IN ADDRESSES DELIVERED

AT MEETINGS IN DUBLIN, LIVERPOOL, BRISTOL, AND BATH,
IN THE YEAR 1834,

BY THE

REV. MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN, A.M.

WITH AN APPENDIX,

CONTAINING COPIOUS NOTES.

LONDON:

JOHN HATCHARD & SON, 187, PICCADILLY;

AND

WILLIAM CURRY, JUN., AND Co. DUBLIN.

1836.

259801A

LONDON :
JOSEPH RICKERBY, PRINTER,
SHERBOURN-LANE.

The circumstance which led to the publication of these Addresses, may be understood from the following correspondence.

"37, St. James's Place.

"MY DEAR SIR,

"SOME noblemen and gentlemen, who have observed with much interest, your exertions in defence of the Protestant Institutions of the kingdom, are desirous that the Speeches you delivered on various occasions, within the last year, should be collected and preserved in a permanent form; and are of opinion that their publication might render extensive service to the good cause in support of which they were spoken. In their behalf I am commissioned, and on my own I gladly accept the commission, to request that, in compliance with our wishes, you will publish a corrected report of those Addresses.

"Believe me, my dear Sir,

"Very faithfully,

"Your obedient servant,

"WILLIAM VERNER."

"To the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan."

"MY DEAR SIR,

"I FEEL honored by the request you have conveyed to me, and am very grateful for the kind, although too flattering terms in which you express your desire that I should comply with it.

" That your praises of my humble efforts exceed their merits, I am, and must be sensible; but I feel it, at the same time, gratifying to know that those, who with you have been betrayed into this generous error, are conspicuous for their devotedness to the cause of truth; and that their favorable opinion is signified by one thoroughly acquainted with my natural disinclination to the exertions which have been so partially commended. You know with what reluctance I suffered the occupations of the quiet and happy obscurity in which Divine Providence had given me all that I desired, to be for a season interrupted; and you do not require to be informed that nothing but a paramount sense of public duty, and I may add, of public danger, could influence me to come forth for the purpose of aiding in the defence of our most precious and sacred institutions, and in the endeavour to procure justice for my cruelly persecuted brethren.

" I shall pay to your request the respectful attention to which I feel it is entitled. Whatever my estimate may have been, of exertions which the difficulty of evil days constrained me to make, the opinion expressed by you, and by those in whose name you write, prescribes to me my course of duty. Addresses which you think worthy of being preserved in a permanent form, I shall endeavour to collect and arrange; and must ever hold it a subject of thankfulness, that they have been held useful, and have procured testimonies of approbation from so many of the wise and good.

" I have the honor to be,
" My dear Sir,
" With all good wishes,
" Most truly yours,
" MORTIMER O'SULLIVAN."

" To Lieut. Col. Verner, M. P.
" 37, St. James's Place."

CONTENTS.

Page

ADDRESS I.—Mansion House, Dublin 1

Notes 155

ADDRESS II.—Conservative Society, Dublin 17

Notes 166

ADDRESS III.—Ditto .. Ditto 61

Notes 190

ADDRESS IV.—Liverpool 76

Notes 196

ADDRESS V.—Bristol 106

Notes 215

ADDRESS VI.—Bath 129

Notes 218

ERRATUM.

Page 20 line 15, *for* " do so," *read* " make them known."
—— 131 and throughout the Address, *for* " Bath Herald," *read* " Bath Journal."

At a Meeting of the PROTESTANTS OF IRELAND, held at the Mansion House, Dublin, on Thursday, August 14, 1834.

The Right Hon. the LORD MAYOR in the Chair.

THE circumstances under which we meet, and the animating addresses to which you have so fully responded, have taught you this stern but salutary truth, that now, for the protection of your dearest interests, for the maintenance of your religion, for defence of life, except in the resources which your own wisdom and union and resolution shall provide, you have no earthly dependence.

I am glad to find you receive the announcement as it should be received by men. Let me not be mistaken. Far be it from us to doubt the cordial friendship of our brethren in England. Even if it could for a moment be forgotten, the presence of the distinguished personage who has honored our meeting—the representative of what is best and noblest in England, representative of a class which has ever watched with most vigilant and most benevolent anxiety over the interests of their Protestant brethren here, would recal it to our remembrance. (A) But, that you should be benefited by the exertions of your friends, you must be true to yourselves. Your cause has been blackened by foul misrepresentations. You must be industrious to refute them;—and, while they are in process of correction, you must be united, and prepared to meet the difficulties to which they now leave you exposed. England, you must remember, is not as she was. The moral pestilence of expediency has found, in her, a body prepared for it. That the stupor, in which she has yielded to pernicious counsel, and abused sound principle, will be broken, and that energies now dormant will be roused into wise action,

the dealings of Providence towards that favored country encourage us strongly to anticipate; but, if you are to be instrumental to that moral renovation, it may depend, so far as human means are effectual, on your use of the opportunities with which you have been mercifully favored, whether the occasion which calls out the spirit of old England, shall be a summons to avenge disasters which can never be repaired—to avenge, it may be, the blood of slaughtered Protestants—or a call to assist you in counteracting efforts calculated to produce irremediable evil; to stand at your side in preventing or in putting down barbarous insurrection.

In order to your having a more distinct view of the difficulties against which you should make provision, allow me, with all plainness of thought and speech, to suggest a contingency which it is of moment that you contemplate. Suppose the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland repealed; (even if you think such a result unlikely, yet for a moment let your imagination assist reason, in presenting it to you as possible—we shall soon see, whether, under existing circumstances, a reflecting man will think such aid necessary;) suppose repeal of the union effected. It might find you unprepared for its attendant dangers, or it might find you resolved and united.

If when separated from England you were found distracted among yourselves, do you imagine that your weakness and your adversaries' success would not summon into existence, or quicken into activity, hopes and claims, and projects, aiming at your utter overthrow? Do you imagine that you could find favor, or time to rally and unite? or do you not feel persuaded that policy might conspire with the impetuous malice of your least disguised enemies in accelerating movements which should not allow you a moment's pause to concert measures by which property could be secured or life defended? Your persecutors would be mistaken in their judgment of England. Their violence would provoke from her offended justice a dreadful retribution. But I can well understand that even crafty men may be wrought upon by the unsteadiness of the British Government to forget the British character, and to think that their crimes against the forsaken Protestants of this land, although they might become the objects

of negotiation, and censure, and menace, would not be visited with a very exemplary vengeance. Do you not then feel convinced that, if the violent in this country were inflamed by triumph and possessed of power, you could, for a time, look to no human defence but that which you had yourselves prepared, and that your condition would be hopeless, if the emergency found you disunited?

On the other hand, suppose yourselves provided to the extent of your power for such an event; can you have any doubt that you would present an obstacle to the progress of crime, such as to make your adversaries feel that they would be highly indiscreet in urging success to extremity? If you were in an attitude which showed that you would not fall tamely, various considerations would make it manifest that to provoke a contest with you would be to challenge defeat; you would afford England, also, time to know the wrong and maintain the right, and to come, if her interposition were called for, an auxiliary, not an avenger. This would be understood; your strength and union would compel forbearance even from avowed enemies, and the certainty that Protestants, throughout all Ireland, were of one heart and mind, would act as a protection in those parts where Protestantism was weakest. I repeat, then, that if you anticipate the day of trial I have imagined, you will acknowledge, that to be unprepared and divided when it came, would be ruinous; that safety could be found only in union and determination.

And now, I would submit for the dispassionate judgment of all who hear me, this question,—is it chimerical to apprehend, that, if you continue regardless and disunited, the projects for the dismemberment of the empire may be successful? The plans to effect that mighty object are artfully contrived—they are prosecuted with energy;—and if you, who think the maintenance of British connection indispensable to the security of your own personal interests, regard with indifference the progress of efforts, which, if not resisted, will add your individual ruin to the national overthrow; what right have you to expect, that others who have no such interests as yours to stimulate their vigilance, will be quicker to discern the danger, or more resolute to withstand it?

On whom will you cast your care, if you are untrue to yourselves? Are you justified in expecting that maxims of general policy, or a sense of official responsibility shall exercise over those to whom the interests of the country have been confided, a more effectual and a happier influence than public feeling and personal concern have acquired over you? Or are you justified in imagining that either the qualities of those distinguished statesmen, who are now in places of power, or the circumstances in which they have to discharge difficult duties, will allow you to be released from anxiety for the general good? I shall not recite again the catalogue of the names and endowments of his Majesty's Ministers. You have already heard their characters sketched by a master's hand. But there were one or two whose connexion with this country renders it almost unavoidable that I should recal them to your remembrance.

The Right Hon. Charles Grant was a Secretary here, and tried his experiment of indulgence, as the true philosophy by which he could sway our fiery populace. What was his success? He conciliated the country into insurrection—an insurrection which extended its outrages to the suburbs of the metropolis. Crime was encouraged by his indiscriminating forbearance; information was withheld from the government, because it was not unreasonably thought, he undervalued or neglected it; and when the natural result of mistaken indulgence and culpable remissness had been experienced, when evils, which Mr. Grant appears never to have anticipated, were fearfully realized; he made an imperfect, although melancholy compensation for the crippled gait at which his disabled justice had proceeded, by stimulating it into revenge. He assented to an act of parliament which suspended the constitution, and subjected the rural population to the rigor of an extreme, but unavoidable severity. I remember well the days and the nights of his lax government, and of the rigid rule by which it was succeeded. I remember when it was described as the last business of the night, before retiring to repose, within a guarded and garrisoned town, to ascend to the house-tops, and count, over the unprotected lands, the flames in which, it might be, slumbering families were consumed, and to listen for shouts

and shrieks which smote the stimulated sense, or disordered fancy created, but which the memory will retain for ever. I remember, too, when shrieks, more terrific than fancy ever heard, arose round the tribunals where the doom of sudden and life-long separation was pronounced—and at the gibbets, where conciliation suspended its sacrifices; and I can in all sincerity declare, that I do not know whether I thought the connivance of the supine Secretary more to be abhorred because of the foul atrocities it encouraged, or because it exacted from returning justice so terrible a retribution. (B) Does your experience of Mr. Grant justify you in expecting that he will be a faithful and wise guardian of the legislative union?

We had also Lord Melbourne as a Secretary here; and, under the protection of his rule, those multitudes were arrayed who marched through the country in military order, and with more than military intimidation. I will not dwell on his brief administration. Short as it was, you have reason to remember it. You know well, that during his brief tenure of place, the elements of disorder became heightened, so as eventually to compel from the unbending resolution of one Minister, and the pledged opposition of another, that concession, without grace or expediency, of which we are now to bide and brave the stormy consequences.

We have here a noble Lord (our Chancellor) appointed, that he might guide one Viceroy into the right way, retained, that he may keep another in it. What has been his political life? More remarkable for its failures than even for the rare talents which render such failures incomprehensible. He never made a pledge which was not violated by the parties in whose behalf he made it; or gave in their name a promise which they did not break: he never uttered a prediction which events did not falsify, or carried through the Houses of Parliament a legislative enactment, upon which, in the circumstances of its failure, rashness or imbecility was not made manifest. I do the Noble Lord wrong. There was one promise to which England may yet find that he has been disastrously faithful. He has erected one monument, of which as a creation of eloquence and taste, Ireland may justly

be proud. It is that in which he has dedicated himself with his children, born and unborn, to the maintenance of an eternal hatred to the principle of a legislative union. The malediction which, upon the occasion of that dedication, he invoked, appears to have persecuted him during his subsequent life, and to have blasted every measure he attempted for the interests of the united country. Will you trust to Lord Plunket to preserve your interests; and believe that while he listens to the wrench and the file at work upon what he declared the sole stay of British connexion, (C) his active mind is employed in fabricating some new bonds by which the severed countries may be reunited?

Or do you rely on the spirit of a British Parliament not to sanction or endure a dismemberment of the empire? Has it escaped your notice, that an individual who is described as having stimulated the Canadas to discontent, is a leading member of that body? (D) Is it out of the nature of things that he shall become a member of the Cabinet. Stage by stage the Government of the country has been degenerating towards his principles and his politics, and the time may not be very far distant when the great champion of Repeal shall hold a Cabinet office; and when there shall be no better counteraction of his devices than may be found in the efforts of one individual who laboured to inflame colonial disaffection, and of another who owes a recorded hate to the Government of an united legislature.

But, to dwell no further on the characters of Ministers or legislators, what has been their conduct in the present Session of Parliament? I will relate, and with all temperance of speech, one chapter of its accidents. The political and the personal so mingle in this story, that it is difficult to expose political delinquencies without affixing a stigma on personal character. I shall, therefore, endeavour to observe a more than ordinary degree of moderation in my expressions, and will confine myself altogether to a recital of matters immediately connected with the subject on which we are engaged.

The present Session of Parliament opened, you all remember, with an unusually vigorous manifestation of purpose. The speech from the throne, condemning in forcible and most un-

equivocal terms that system of agitation which exercised so pernicious an influence in Ireland, almost directly, certainly by strong implication, stigmatised the agent in the destructive process. Whatever doubt the King's speech may have left on this subject, the Chancellor (E)—the keeper of the King's conscience—dissipated, in that memorable invective against a personal and political mendicancy, unacquainted with a sense of shame or honour, in which the learned orator invoked the shade of his favoured poet, to bear testimony against the unparalleled, because the boastful, baseness of modern beggary.

I pass no judgment on a proceeding like this; whether it was prudent, or dignified, or just, I do not pause to enquire. I merely say, that, if there be consistency in ministerial measures, the text of the King's speech is explained by the comment of the Chancellor, and we may regard the opening of the session of parliament as rendered memorable by the denunciation of an individual. But, surely, the odour of gain, however acquired, is good. Few months elapse before mendicancy has lost its disrelish. The beggar of the ministers' vernal invective, is, in their summer panegyric, his country's benefactor. The practices which had provoked the scorn of these honorable men, prove recommendations to their favor. The change from the grub to the butterfly, is not half so wonderful as this. The vilest appurtenances of the patriots' mendicant existence are touched with a transforming power and glory—his bags have become wings—he has cast the slough of an ignoble condition—he has soared up into the sunny region of ministerial favor—he is an object of courtly competition—and, in the eagerness to make him a cabinet prize, all friendships are forgotten, all decorums disregarded; and Stanley, and Richmond, and Ripon, and Graham, and Grey, are shouldered out and trodden down in the mad chase which hoar and bearded juveniles urge after the gorgeous creature which, if it do not

"Lead them on from flower to flower,"

may at least be said to conduct them

"A weary chase and wasted hour."

But we must be serious. The denounced of the King's speech

becomes the caressed of the King's ministers—the confidant of their secret cares—the fashioner of their political contrivances, and, in the face of the country and the world, their unyielding and unceremonious dictator. And all this time the change has been solely in his Majesty's ministers—the object of their admiration is just what he was, unmitigated in sentiment and language. He pronounces the national faith of England a farce. (F) In his speech on moving for a repeal of the union, he betrays the remembrances which Ireland still cherishes of wrong, and discloses the grounds of unforgiving animosity which must remain so long as the soil of Ireland is burdened by a Saxon proprietor.

That speech, my lord, has not had its due honor. It has been styled inappropriate and indiscreet:—it was so if it had no other object than to persuade the British parliament and people. To remind England of jealousies and animosity existing in the hearts of the people of this country, and to let it be seen that there were testimonies carefully preserved, which must render such animosity lasting, was a bad preface to a demand for enlarged power, and would be deservedly styled weak and puerile. But, consider the speech in another point of view,—as intended for readers in Ireland,—as meant to show them what language might be spoken in the senate of their haughty oppressors —a speech of which parliament was the stage, but the Irish repealers were the real auditory; regard it as the shout of the Roman soldiery, careless how they startled their slumbering enemies, so that they sent cheer and courage to the hearts of their beleagured comrades, and then you can estimate its merit, and can understand how a tale of Irish wrong and suffering, and of English cruelty and spoil, trumpeted forth in the parliament of Great Britain, was calculated to arouse the confidence and exasperate the angry passions of that large body in this country, who are, when it shall seem good, to give a fiery impulse to the movement of agitation. Does it not disturb the confidence with which you would cast all care for yourselves on the members of the Cabinet, that the speaker of such an harangue is he whom they have installed as an honorary prime-minister?

But this is too grave a complaint. He is not invested with power. No evil is intended. The experiment of force and sternness was found injudicious or inconvenient; now there is a trial of skill between the British ministry and the champion of repeal. What has the first acknowledged move in the game brought to light? What has it effected? It has branded on the ministry the stigma of indiscretion. (G) They have themselves pleaded guilty to the charge. Bearing in mind the well-known maxim, that an error is worse than a crime, his Majesty's ministers have passed over in silence the minor count in the indictment, and with characteristic manliness, have pleaded guilty to the graver accusation. So understood, the first move in the game has convicted government of indiscretion—has driven from their councils their acknowledged leader, and has deprived them of the powers by which, alone, they could restrain political agitation. It has gained for the champion of repeal the confidence which success inspires. It has given him the measure of his antagonist's discretion, and it has released for him a power well proved, and adapted to the procuring further advantages. He is free to agitate. How that freedom may be exercised—whether it shall be most advisable to purchase great concession by indulging the ministry in a seeming repose, or to compel success by clamour, we may not pronounce; but we can well understand that a minister of the crown may, at the opening of the next session of parliament, ask for congratulations on the tranquillity of Ireland, to purchase which he has silently made sacrifices greater than agitation would dare to demand; or he may turn the attention of the country to the disorder by which Ireland continues afflicted, and impress upon a compliant auditory the conviction that no sacrifice can be too great to prevent such agitation from swelling into civil war.

We have, no doubt, a noble lord's assurance, that, if agitation put forth its strength, he will summon parliament and demand further power to subdue it; but when agitation comes, where will he be? How will parliament be disposed? We have too often had such assurances, and too often learned their hollowness, not to distrust them. Indeed, now they appear little more than an

augury of abdication, and remind us of the poor Irish criminal's deprecating speech, when he heard the judge pronounce the recommendation to divine mercy with which the extreme sentence of the law is concluded. "I want no such words, my lord—I never knew a man live long after they were spoken." Such an omen is Lord Melbourne's promise, that he will correct the licentiousness to which he has yielded a free course, so soon as he finds its disorders inconvenient.

But it is not the mere superstition of an unlucky sentence which should cause us to apprehend the removal from power of those who would repress agitation. It was among the worst evils of the late changes that they were made under circumstances very unusual, and, it may be added, very distasteful to the feelings of Englishmen. There is an old prejudice, called honor, which cannot easily be eradicated, and there are some members of the present ministry who may feel a retrospect of the incidents which attended the departure of their late chief, any thing rather than comfortable; some who may feel painful misgivings, as they reflect upon such precedents for clandestine diplomacy. And of this we may be certain, that it is the most honorable who will be least secure, and who will feel most discontent in the cabinet where Earl Grey was circumvented.

As to the concessions which may be purchased by abstinence from agitation, they can be inferred from those which it has obtained already. His majesty's ministers have declared that the state has a right to assume the disposal of church property; and, in accordance with the declaration, they have endeavoured to confiscate two-fifths of our ecclesiastical revenue.

An attempt of this nature ought to have been accompanied with a statement of the principles by which it was justified. It is a fearful thing, in days like ours, to confound the notions of power and right, and to leave it dependent on the will of a minister, and the votes of a parliamentary majority, what shall be held just. I am not arguing the question whether the state has any such right as is assumed—I am free to admit that it can exercise exorbitant power; but I warn you that days of peril are at hand, when a minister of the crown shall assume a right which has

never before been asserted, and without assigning a single reason in justification of his assumption, shall succeed in compelling parliament to register it.

The state has a right to dispose at its pleasure of the surplus revenues of the church!—it has a right to decide what shall be accounted surplus revenues! The state has a right! where can such a right be discovered? Had Edward any knowledge of such a right when he enacted the statutes of mortmain? If the dead grasp of a corporation could be unlocked by so compendious a process, what could be more desirable for a monarch than to see property accumulate in the reservoirs of the church—from which the right of the state to dispose of its surplus revenues could, at a convenient season, release it? Did he know of this right, who, in the very principle of an act forbidding the enlargement of church possessions, recognised the inviolability of all precedent acquisitions? Did the ministers of Charles the Second know of any such right, when they negociated with the church, nor for the power to confiscate its property, but for the privilege to tax ecclesiastical persons in the same manner as other subjects of the crown? Was any such right acknowledged when, as our adversaries say, property was taken from the Church of Rome and transferred to the Church of England—or when, as we say, property was vindicated from foreign usurpation, and the subjects of a British monarch released from the distracting influences of contradictory obligations? (H) I am not arguing the question. Neither our statements nor those of our adversaries should be accepted as proofs. Let the principle be fairly examined. This is the age of commissions. The joint-stock mania—the spirit which deluded the people in past years seems now to have subsided into the recesses of the ministerial cabinet, and to manifest its prolific presence in the out-pouring of endless commissions. Why was not this principle of the right of the state, the assumption of which expelled four ministers from their places, made the subject of a commission, and thus invested with some appearance of plausibility?

I would ask this not on behalf of the Church. For the Church I ask for nothing, but what, even in the present House of Com-

mons, if any thing of English spirit has been suffered to remain there, I am justified in expecting. It is—that honorable members will not continue so to forget what becomes their place, and what is owing to ours, as to add to the injury they would do, the unnecessary and dangerous aggravation of insulting language. I do not deprecate or dread insult from members of the Roman Catholic persuasion. They are merely discharging a duty to their Church, which demands that they account every thing subordinate to her exaltation—nor from any Irish representatives who occupy their seats on the condition that they pay for them the due quota of foul language. This is all as it should be, and perhaps exasperates no existing evil; but when British members—learned civilians—men who make profession of piety—describe a church with whose character and operation they have never sought to make themselves acquainted, as "an abominable nuisance"—when they do this in a place where no Minister of that Church can be admitted to reply—a place, where in ancient days, the recollection of our necessary absence created for us in every gentleman a protector; I am disappointed—that they will forget their situation and ours, that they will disregard the obvious truth, that their vehement invectives against a system will be translated by the fierce passions of those who hate that system into a denunciation of its Ministers,—and that they will not feel it a cruel and an unmanly abuse of privileged impunity, to indulge prejudice or spleen in the utterance of taunts, which, whatever be the spirit in which they are spoken, here in Ireland give direction and encouragement to ferocious passions, and become provocatives to murder.

I would expect of a British Parliament that, for the honour of England, they would reprobate these wanton and cruel attacks on the persecuted and absent. This is not too much to expect on behalf of the Church and its Ministers.

But how will the usurpation of Church property affect you? Has any principle been laid down by which a valid distinction can be drawn between the nature of your charter and ours? None but the principle of a parliamentary majority—and thus all sanctity is withdrawn by which possession heretofore was guarded.

Whatever *can* be done in Parliament *may* be done. The distinctinction which an eloquent speaker who preceeded me, so well established between right and power, is lost in a state of things in which might becomes "lord of imbecility," and a new ingredient is thrown into the cauldron of agitation, arising out of the unequal distribution of property, and the assertion of a principle, that the state has a right to dispose of all surplus revenues.

But let us have hope. The last packet has brought us intelligence that the House of Lords has stood between the country and an evil by which the principle of justice would be grievously shaken. The Lords have thrown out the bill. Whatever the consequence may be to us, we should be thankful that God has inspired them so to do. I have, I confess, one serious drawback on my satisfaction. A right reverend prelate of this country advocated the spoliation, and declared that he did so because he had numerous letters of solicitation from his Clergy, by which he was influenced. From what I know of the Clergy in his lordship's diocess, as well as in all other parts of the kingdom, I am bold to say that they sinned in ignorance of the bill they recommended:—If there be any here similarly forgetful, or if any will read the words I speak, who are not acquainted with the provisions of the bill which has been so justly cast out, I would beg their attention to a very brief explanation of its nature:—A short time since an act was passed, constituting the revenues of ten bishoprics, according as they became vacant, and a tax levied on parochial revenues, a fund for defraying the expenses of worship in the Established Church, the maintenance of churches, and other necessary charges.—The bill thrown out of the Lords on Monday proposed to confiscate the greater part—perhaps the entire of the revenue thus provided, and to convert it into a free-will offering to the landlords of Ireland. That is to say, the bill proposed to confiscate the fund provided by a tax on the Ministers of Religion, and intended to secure the permanence of an external ministration; to take from the poor Protestants the provision made for their religious edification, and to bestow their rights upon the wealthy. This is the bill which the Clergy of the Right Reverend Prelate recom-

mended to their Diocesan, and for which they solicited his advocacy. I am sorry to hear that their unacquaintance with the provisions of the bill, has had so unhappy a manifestation. I have a Diocesan whose sentiments upon the rejected measure I have no mode of ascertaining. Except from knowledge of his character I cannot conjecture his opinion; but I seriously and sincerely declare that I would rather be a suppliant for his private bounty, and entreat to be placed among the pensioners upon a munificence large and liberal as that of princes, and secret as the letter of Christian precepts requires, and implore that he would give me, for my children, a morsel of bread, than I would dare to affront his noble mind by soliciting his advocacy of a measure, which should have for its object to take from the fund which was the sacred property of poor Protestants, and at their cost to embellish Tyrone House, or enlarge the noble demesnes of Curraghmore. Among the many evils of recent legislation, there is one thing which in moments of excitement a sensitive nature feels as good—the power of bearing testimony to exalted worth, without dreading the imputation of a sordid motive. We may have change of duty, not preferment. And it is among its crying evils that it shall have so warped a high mind, that a Right Reverend Prelate in his distrust of the British Ministry, will rather advocate a measure which contemplates the plunder of the poorer Protestants, than leave the Clergy to the protection of a Monarch whose coronation oath only solemnizes, as it were, the prompt and kindly disposition of his heart to afford them ample protection.

Certainly, when one considers the language employed by Ministers of the Crown, it is not wonderful that the generous heart of the Prelate—he is a generous and kindly-natured man—should be so affected. When a Lord Chancellor of England could threaten that Government would enforce all its claims upon the Clergy—claims incurred in consequence of a poverty with which the declarations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer (I) were chargeable, and, at the same time, could intimate, in no ambiguous terms, that Government, resolute in enforcing its own

rights, to the ruin of the unoffending Clergy, was equally resolute to leave the rights of these persecuted men deserted—it is not perhaps wonderful that the Prelate became alarmed; although it would be far more desirable that such a declaration had roused up an English spirit, and dictated a dutiful supplication to the throne, soliciting to know if the keeper of the King's conscience were the interpreter of the King's sentiments, and if William IV. and Lord Chancellor Brougham held the coronation oath in the same lowliness of estimation.

But I have, it is probable, dwelt at too great length on matters peculiar to my order. It is, however, simply, because your interests are only by one remove separated from ours. If you thought only of yourselves, even of your worldly interests, it would be your prudence to prepare, and to discern, in the persecutions which have come on our body, perils impending over your own. The treacherous and the ignorant will deride such dark forebodings, and will dissuade you, if it be possible, from the determination to prepare for an evil day. According to their advice, your most prudent course would be to remain unprovided, and, if you could, indifferent. They will tell you that it is your wisdom to cast your care on those who are appointed to govern; and that if you will abandon all anxiety about yourselves, and place implicit confidence in your rulers, you shall have the reward; you shall be soothed by promises that no explosion will take place until Antrim and Armagh are reduced or exalted to the state of those counties over which a blood-stained tranquillity stretches forth its reign of terror—where the King's Ministers have their most zealous and numerous adherents, and where the King and the people of England must reckon upon their most unappeasable enemies.

If you prefer this graduated process of destruction;—give up all care for your safety or possessions, and wait until the assassin or the spoiler pronounces that he is ready, and that your turn is come; but if you think it better to oppose danger than lie down before it—better to possess power, though evil tongues may speak ill of it, than propitiate the slanderer's silence

and purchase truce of the murderer by division and imbecility—above all, if you account it a solemn duty to maintain the good cause confided to your keeping, in any circumstances wherein your service is righteously demanded,—leave not this place;—let no man depart, without recording in his heart a resolution, that, by all honest means—all means on which he can implore God to send down a blessing—he will promote Protestant union.

At a Meeting of the PROTESTANT CONSERVATIVE SOCIETY of IRELAND, held at their Rooms, Grafton-street, Dublin, on Tuesday, the 9th September, 1834.

The Right Hon. the Earl of RODEN in the Chair.

BEFORE submiting the statement which it is my duty to lay before you, I am desirous to correct a slight inaccuracy in the terms in which my notice of it has been reported. They represent me as having attributed the union which is now cementing among Protestants, to the indignation naturally awakened by unprincipled and impolitic concession. I took, at least I desired to take, straighter limits for our justification, and meant to say, that it was not indignation which influenced us, but a sense of danger, the manifestations of which had become unequivocal, and which we felt to be daily augmenting and drawing near.

It would be unnecessary to notice a slight inaccuracy of this nature which, indeed, the general character of our proceedings must correct, but that, appearing to redeem my pledge, it seems fitting that I should remind you what that pledge really was. It contemplated what our enemies will say was a more difficult, and what all will acknowledge to be a more important duty than that of proving that a just anger has aroused us. I undertook to show that the principle of self-preservation is the principle of our union—and that there is a manifest necessity, if we would protect life, and interests far dearer than life, of preparing ourselves, by all legitimate means, strongly to defend them.

Since I gave notice of such an intention, circumstances have induced me to alter, in some respects, the form of carrying it into execution. Events succeed each other so rapidly, and disclosures

of so astounding a character are made as matters of ordinary occurrence, that ample indulgence may be expected for such alterations. My design on the present occasion is, however, precisely the same as on the day when I last addressed you, namely, to vindicate the propriety of Protestant union.

Our adversaries ask, what grievance have we to complain of,—in what do we suffer wrong? As if the graves which cover the honored remains of many martyred ministers of our religion, had covered also the memory of their pious and charitable lives, and of the inhuman murders by which they suffered death, they ask us, what are our grievances. As if the frequent aspect of many of their afflicted survivors, driven from homes where their free charities can no longer protect them—where the law does not—had dulled the feelings with which we contemplate the destitute condition of pious men driven forth from the competence which had rewarded meritorious exertion, and condemned, in their mature or declining years, to seek, among comparative strangers, some humble employment which may give them sustenance for their families; they ask us, what are your grievances. They ask us what are our grievances, when the confidant of the ministry boasts, that he must have government countenance in his war, active and passive, against the property of our church; when men who have supplicated to be placed as tenants on the lands of a Protestant proprietary, who have been told the conditions of occupancy, (that a certain sum is to be paid as rent to the lay proprietor — a sum also, under a different name, to another claimant,) when these men, having obtained their desire, accepted the conditions, and poured out the overflowing gratitude of hearts that seemed as though they never could adequately express their feelings,—turn round with defiance on their benefactors, and proclaim that they will not observe the conditions of their agreement; that they will, if it must be, break the law—will destroy life—but will not hold to the conditions of their tenantcy—will not surrender the lands upon which the despised obligation was laid—because their conscience demands that they prove false to their engagements. Conscience!—who has sounded the depths of this mysterious conscience, or noted

the under-currents by which it escapes from God's law and man's reason? And who is so weak as to believe, that when this conscience can bring power to back its principles, the claim of the lay Protestant will not be treated with precisely the same disregard as now manifests the character of the Romish Church in its justice towards ecclesiastical creditors?

But I pass over these and such matters of complaint as are symptoms of the great evil, rather than independent grievances, and answer; our complaint is this—there is in Ireland an extensive and well organised conspiracy to extirpate Protestantism; and the conduct pursued, by a party powerful in the state, towards Protestants and towards the enemies of British connexion, is calculated to strengthen it; and we complain that the disfavor by which Protestants are discountenanced if not dejected—the capricious demeanour of government towards their adversaries, now curbing, now caressing, is eminently calculated to inflame an evil purpose, and encourage and facilitate the most destructive and criminal projects: yes—even though they involved an attempt at massacre.

Do I think so ill of my countrymen as to apprehend so foul a design? I do not think evil of them. Few men better know—none more prompt to acknowledge and to praise their generous qualities, their high deserts; but I know the human heart, that it is wicked and deceitful; and I know that never was there a system of more fatal power to nurture what is worst, and to destroy what is good within us, than that discipline of combination and outrage in which multitudes in this unhappy country have been trained.

I know, too, that it is not by the majority of a people the foulest crimes are planned and perpetrated. Many a time, as experience teaches, a few without conscience or pity, strong in their estrangement from human sympathies, and combining closely together, have, through the appearance of power, exercised real power, and compelled submissive instruments to execute their black purposes. I know that in times of public commotion and unsettlement such are the combinations which prevail, and if affairs proceed in their present direction and continue obedient

to the impulses by which they are now governed, the time is not very distant, when many who lead in the movement party here, the glosers who speak smooth things — the hurlers of verbal defiance, whose seeming frankness serves as an antidote to suspicion—will pass away, by constraint or at command; like Milton's spirits, unmasking the devilish enginery they are no longer required to cover; and will leave the stage vacant for a revelation of malignity,—such as shall obliterate from memory the less revolting atrocities of the French revolution. This is my deliberate conviction. If I did not think the grievances and the dangers of the Protestants extreme, I would not suffer the habits of my retired and peaceful life to be disturbed by the interruption of politics.

I am, however, well aware, that, except to myself, my convictions must be matter of small concern. The grounds of Protestant alarm should be more fully stated. I shall endeavour to do so. In the endeavour, I must necessarily advert to matter with which you are all acquainted, and must state arguments and draw conclusions which you may have often exhibited to yourselves, but which it is not unimportant or unnecessary to have repeated. Without further preface, then, I undertake to prove three propositions from which our grievances and our alarm may be understood.

1st. There is a party in Ireland comprising a very large portion of the population, desirous to extirpate Protestantism, and to effect a separation of this country from England. (A)

2d. The moral and physical force of the combined Protestants, especially in Ulster, constitutes the great obstacle by which this party is discouraged. (B)

3d. The conduct of the British Government, in its acts and omissions, is calculated to weaken, and if not counteracted, ultimately to destroy this power, to which, humanly speaking, Ulster is indebted for its tranquillity, and the other provinces of Ireland, for that (however imperfect) degree of security and protection, which the union with Great Britain is enabled to extend to them. (C)

These are the main propositions which I undertake to establish,

and, on the proof of which, I rest our justification for entering into any defensive society which law permits, and which shall be regulated by Christian principle.

The existence in Ireland of "hostility to the law and to British connexion," is now little disputed. It ought not to be difficult for rational men to discern the character of such hostility, and to calculate the dangers to which it must necessarily give rise. In Ireland, the two religious professions are as two nations. There may be, and most assuredly there are, in very many instances, individual attachments; there are many instances in which the character is not to be judged by the denomination;—but, speaking generally, it may be said that the Protestants of Ireland love British connexion, and are obedient willingly to the laws; that Roman Catholics, as such, have their feelings towards England affected by remembrances and sentiments calculated to impress them with a character of hostility.

This truth will be better understood at the present day than it could have been some years since. Then it was contended that Roman Catholics in Ireland could be attached by concessions, which seemed just and reasonable; that is to say, just and reasonable according to the estimate made by those who granted them; and it was even said that the conduct and principles of Roman Catholics in England justified the most favorable expectations which could be entertained of members of their communion in this country. It was forgotten that the situation of the parties, thus identified, by no means justified such anticipations. In England, the influence of the religion was combated by national feeling. Members of the church of Rome could not lose the consciousness that they were Englishmenn also; and it was not irrational to hope that the same spirit which had in former days resisted Papal encroachment, and maintained the national interest and honor, would again be found efficient in directing safely the exercise of any privilege with which English Roman Catholics might be favored. In Ireland the religious and the national feeling so mingle, that they cannot be separated. Both tend to produce alienation from England. Much might be said on this subject,

but I ought not, I feel, do more than notice the distinction, that two of the most powerful principles of our nature, in the case of English Roman Catholics, oppose, and, it may be, to some extent neutralize each other;—and that here, in Ireland, in the hearts of men who live amid traditions of individual wrong, and national debasement; in a country conquered but not subdued; these principles are not opposed, but, on the contrary, impart, mutually, increase of strength, and render more impracticable that feeling of hostility to England, to which both are found to minister.

It is, I am aware, very industriously contended, that nothing but the poverty of the people of this country occasions their disaffection; I am quite willing to admit that poverty exasperates the feeling, and that, in the absence of those interests upon which men are ordinarily occupied, it leaves a vacancy for national and sectarian influences, which render discontent more pernicious. I do not, therefore, deny the truth, that much of our disorder is traceable to wretchedness, and that there was a time when a due concern for the domestic circumstances of our poorer countrymen would have been productive of almost all the good which sanguine men now anticipate from an improvement in their condition; but what I contend for, and what I am confident is the persuasion of a reverend and eloquent friend,* who never loses sight of the condition of the poor, is this—that we are not to ascribe the disaffection of a large portion of the people of Ireland to distress alone, but to a sense of misery acted upon by influences, which, like wicked spirits, taking possession of the house prepared for them, aggravate and perpetuate the evil which has attracted them.

I am induced to make this remark, because of the recent appearance of one of those pamphlets† in which the problem of Ireland's difficulties is so compendiously and inadequately solved; which teaches, that past concessions having been unprofitable, it is necessary to grant, now, what may not be received as a concession, and to tranquillize Ireland by inducing the people to

* The Rev. Charles Boyton. † Mr. Poulett Scrope's.

declare themselves paupers, while they are yet, it may be, proud in the hope that they can become masters of the country.

But I must not be supposed to offer an opinion on a subject with which I am not immediately concerned. I must not overstep my province, which is, admitting the evil and insubordination induced by the poverty of a large multitude of our people, to prove that other causes give to this insubordination a character which demands more cautious treatment than even the tumults arising out of poverty. I maintain, that it is reasonable to suspect more ambitious designs in the spirit which engenders Irish disorder, than that of providing for individual want, —and on these grounds,—because religious prejudices are very strongly felt by Irish Roman Catholics; because their national feelings combine with religious in exciting hostility to England; and because they cherish a persuasion that their ancestors were unjustly despoiled of possessions, to which those who are now the legal masters, have no just title.

And here, my Lord, I would advert to a circumstance which ought not to be overlooked among the presumptive proofs that the mass of the poorer Roman Catholics entertain larger views than the mere acquisition of some personal comforts. It is generally said, and is, indeed, so well known as to render proof superfluous, that Mr. O'Connell is, as Mr. Poulett Scrope affirms, the organ of the popular feeling in Ireland. He has proved that he has power to appease or excite, as if he were not only the organ, but the director of their feelings. He retains his place and power, notwithstanding the disappointment felt by a majority of the Roman Catholic people in the long-sought emancipation, which, they complain, has proved no advantage to them. (D) Now, it is a very memorable fact, that Mr. O'Connell has never, in any single instance, attempted a measure by which the peasantry could be benefited. Any remission of tithe, all men know, would induce a corresponding increase of rent. The remission of church cess has the same effect, and Mr. O'Connell has himself characterised it as paltry; but even this is not his measure. The peasant complains of excessive rent, and parades the complaint as one of his justifications for conspiring against the law—Mr. O'Con-

nell has never attempted to regulate rents. The peasant complains of insecurity of tenure—Mr. O'Connell has never endeavoured to give him permanency of possession. The peasant complains that his labour has no adequate remuneration—Mr. O'Connell has never contended for a rise of wages. The peasant complains that the unemployed, the old, and infirm are not supported—Mr. O'Connell has invariably opposed the enactment of a poor law(E)—and yet Mr. O'Connell is the organ and the director of popular feeling; and a people suffering under various privations, and conspiring against law, for no other purpose (if we are to believe modern politicians) than to procure clothes and food, look up to one who never took thought to provide them either—acknowledge him as their organ—respect him as their director; and, out of the extreme poverty to the enjoyment of which he complacently resigns them, create for him, it might be said, (for it seems to be formed from nothing,) by voluntary contribution, a larger salary, all things considered, than rewards the exertions of any minister or any officer under the crown. If the rural population of Roman Catholic districts in Ireland had no object but such as some wise men ascribe to them, is it to be supposed that one who is remarkable, amidst all his enterprises, for having never enterprised any thing for them, should have obtained so disproportionate remuneration?

I pass away from this topic, and not extending further the enumeration of presumptive evidences, I proceed by a brief detail of facts to confirm them.

I do not mean to dwell on the troubles and alarms by which the early part of the past century was characterised, or the refusal of the Roman Catholics to take an oath of allegiance—a refusal not dictated by their own judgment of what was right, but given in obedience to the directions of the Pope. I pass over the plot which was detected in 1729, which had for its objeet to restore James III.; and, as its means, an extensive sale of indulgences and a contribution from Roman Catholic ecclesiastics. I pass over also a recital of the arguments by which it was contended that no oath of fidelity should be taken to a king who was (or who had married) a Protestant—and I affirm this instructive

truth,—that, in the year 1759, England became, for the first time, seriously alarmed by preparations made in France for the invasion of this country—that in the same year, the Whiteboy disturbances commenced in the county of Cork; the first disturbances of any note which had taken place since the revolution;—and that, from that time to the present hour, Ireland has never been tranquil.

I by no means wish to conceal the fact, that in the year 1759 many opulent Roman Catholics presented a dutiful address to the throne, and testified a resolution, by all means in their power, to support the existing government: nor do I wish to disguise the mortifying truth, that Protestant gentry were said to connive at, and abet, the excesses of a rustic rebellion, by which they hoped to obtain deliverance from the impost of tithe. It is well known, too, that insurrection did not avow any more ambitious object than that of redressing the wrongs suffered in consequence of the illegal inclosure of commons, and the severe exactions of tithe proctors; for it is important to bear in mind, that, until the present day, (when Roman Catholics might be supposed to feel the attachment of benefits to the state, and the obligation of additional and unambiguous oaths not to disturb the arrangement of property, or the church establishment,) the abolition of tithe was never avowed as an object in any agrarian insurrection.

But while it is admitted that the parties by whose advice or exertions the country was disturbed, were not so rash as to announce designs which would compel England effectually to crush rebellion, it should also be remembered, as it is observed in the judicious and eloquent *State of Ireland*, that "the alleged grounds of Irish insurrection are seldom the real." It is well known, that, during the excitement of these agrarian disorders, a system of enlistment for the French service, while France was at war with us, prevailed extensively. Private soldiers were sworn simply to obey their officers—the officers having taken an oath of military service to the French King and to Prince Charles.

The disorders were apparently suppressed by the rigorous enforcement of severe laws. But it would appear, that, in reality,

the manifestations, only, of a disorderly spirit were prevented—the evil remained, and became formidably visible, when "the hordes of petty rebels," as Mr. Croker writes, "that for twenty years, under twenty barbarous names and pretences, had harassed the land, sank," in 1798, "into one great union against all civil and ecclesiastical institutions." This rebellion was put down, but it left materials for further disorder behind, and left also experience by which those materials might be wrought to the most advantage. In the testimony of certain well known individuals, who had been prime organisers of the rebellion, and who obtained remission of punishment, we find some important information. Lord Castlereagh questioned Dr. M'Nevin as to the probable effect of the insurrection which had just been put down, and received an answer, of which this is part:—"It will teach the people that caution which some of their friends less successfully endeavoured to inculcate." Mr. M'Nevin was asked also, to what number he thought the United Irishmen amounted all over the kingdom? he returned for answer, "Those who have taken the test do not, I am convinced, fall short of 500,000, without reckoning women and old men. The number regularly organized is not less than 300,000; and I have no doubt all these will be ready to fight for the liberties of Ireland whenever they get a fair opportunity."* Admitting that this number was very considerably lessened by the falling off of all who discerned, in the massacre of Protestants by the rebels in Wexford, what was to be expected if rebellion became successful—still a very great number must have remained pledged to prosecute the objects for which rebellion had been undertaken.

Far be it from me to affirm that all the individuals, even of the Roman Catholic persuasion, who had been engaged in the conspiracy in 1798, and who escaped its penalties, continued hostile to the British Government; but the state of Ireland, it must be confessed, since the commencement of the present century, indicates the presence of a treasonable spirit, taking advantage of every opportunity to advance evil purposes, and to con-

* Pieces of Irish History, by T. A. Emmett, Esq. and Dr. M'Nevin.

vert agrarian outrage into rebellion. It is not necessary to dwell at any length on the history of this period. It was, throughout, a period of disorder. A rebellion in 1803—"a rebellion," as it has been described, "short in its duration, contemptible in its actions, but serious in its unsounded depth and unknown extent." Disturbances commencing in Connaught in 1806, extending eastward into Leinster in 1809, spreading over Munster in 1810-11, and continuing since, with brief intervals of enforced and suspicious armistice, to agitate the three provinces, and to familiarise the hearts of our peasantry to crimes of unexampled atrocity—disturbances, of which the effect has been to render the power of the insurgent far more dreaded than that of the law.

The tumults in these provinces were, it is said, at first, purely agrarian; and the political character they afterwards assumed is said to have been imparted to them by the Ribbon system, a continuance of the Defender Association of the last century, which innoculated, with a political and religious animosity, every disorder by which the country was infested. Testimony to this effect was borne by various individuals—among others, by the police inspectors examined before the Parliamentary Committee in 1824-25. (F)

The objects of the conspiracy entered into by Ribbonmen are, as it was proved before these committees, to establish the Roman Catholic church, to extirpate Protestantism, and to separate Ireland from Great Britain.—The propagators of the system availed themselves of every local disorder for the purpose of introducing their own principles; so that it was invariably found that when disturbances were of long continuance, they lost their desultory character, and became methodized into a political oganization. The system of organization resembled that of the United Irishmen. No individual was to swear more than thirty-six persons, who were to be considered a body within themselves, and were to have a committee-man, a treasurer, and a secretary belonging to them. The committee-man was to communicate with the committee-man of another lodge, but the subordinate individuals knew nothing beyond the circle of their own body. The committee-men of the various lodges assembled occasionally, and

met the delegates sent from Dublin, to whom they were perfect strangers, and of whom the same men never came down more than once. In short, it was the system of the United Irishmen, animated by the foul and ferocious spirit of Defenderism, and adapted to the altered circumstances of the present day.

Surely it would be unreasonable to suppose that the Ribbon confederacy, watching for every opportunity to introduce its principles, did not endeavour also to create the favorable occasions, and not to believe that the crimes and disturbances by which our age has been disgraced arose, not purely out of the wants and passions of the perpetrators, but, were the offences of men whose minds were acted upon by individuals endeavouring to overthrow the government, and who considered predial outrage as preparing the way for political organization. Indeed, on one occasion an indirect but a most remarkable testimony was borne to the reasonableness of this suspicion. It was when, on Sir Arthur Wellesley's bringing in the Insurrection Act in 1807, Mr. Grattan declared that there was a French party in Ireland, and that he was willing to share in the responsibility of ministers in taking measures to meet the evil.

As yet I have not spoken of Roman Catholic ecclesiastics, but the subject is of too much moment to be omitted. It is to be remembered, then, that the bishops in the church of Rome (as appears from the Stuart papers, and from the testimony borne by the late Right Rev. Dr. Doyle) were appointed by the Pretender to the throne of England, until towards the close of the last century; that Mr. O'Connell, in his evidence before the committee in 1825, declared, that " in the time of his father and uncle, the priests educated on the Continent were Jacobites—that they were enemies to a certain extent; while they submitted to the laws, their own opinions ran against the succession of the present family on the throne; and they were, perhaps, dangerous before the French revolution in that respect;"—that Mr. O'Connell also said of the existing clergy of his communion, educated at Maynooth, that " they are more identified with the people—and therefore in the phrase that is usually called loyalty, they do not come within the description of it so much as the priests educated

in France," whom he described, remember, as enemies to the house of Hanover. Dr. Doyle has confirmed the statement:*— "The minister of England cannot look to the exertions of the Catholic priesthood. They have been ill treated; and they may yield for a moment to the influence of nature, though it be opposed to grace. This clergy, with few exceptions, are from the poorer ranks of the people; they inherit their feelings; they are not, as formerly, brought up under despotic governments"—(thus is the freedom of England converted into a reason and a facility for opposing her)—" and they have imbibed the doctrines of Locke and Paley more deeply than those of Bellarmine, or even of Bossuet, on the divine right of kings."

From such testimonies, we learn this important truth. As long as what Mr. O'Connell terms a spirit of ultra-royalty could render the Roman Catholic clergy inimical to the British Sovereign, they were taught to believe in the divine right of kings, and they received promotion from the exiled but still pretending house of Stuart;—as soon as the claims of that house ceased to be urged, the doctrines of royalty were exploded, and a system of education, which alienated the Roman Catholic clergy from the British minister, and identified them in feeling with "the Irish people," was that in which they were prepared for their sacerdotal duties.

If the morals of the Roman Catholic population in Ireland accord with what should be expected from such instructors—if there be abundant proof afforded that their obedience to the law is merely matter of prudential calculation—if it be accounted righteous to abet and screen the murderer—a crime and a stigma which attaints the blood, to assist law in bringing a murderer to justice; (and here I would ask, how can it be explained that he who thus aids the law—"the informer," as he is styled, and the well remembered and deeply execrated name of the traitor, who in old days "sold the pass," shall be held in equal detestation, unless there be, through the entire Roman Catholic people, a practical persuasion, that now, as in the days of Cromwell, the

* Letter to Mr. Robertson.

state of Ireland is a state of war, and that England has no rights, except those of a foreign and hostile country?) if men, dying on the scaffold, account themselves, and are so accounted, martyrs in a good cause—and if they imagine that they die free from sin, although they bear with them knowledge by which, if communicated, fearful evil might be averted—if, after having religious consolations, and the ministration of the priest, they may be heard lamenting at their last hour, that one murder less than they had designed can be ascribed to them, and declaring that "it is not their fault" if the Bible intercepted the deadly weapon, and frustrated, the attempt to kill,——(G) is it irrational to conclude, that, as the principles and conduct of such men can be explained only on the supposition that they conceive themselves to owe no allegiance to the State, they have, at least, never been led to a sense of political duty, by ecclesiastics, who were Jacobites, as long as the Stuarts advanced a claim to the British throne; and who, when such claims ceased to be urged, were trained in opposite principles, and "inherited the feelings" which the Irish people had been taught to cherish.

To conclude this part of my subject, and recapitulate the heads of the topics to which I have adverted;—I have shown—

1. That from 1759, when the invasion of this country was meditated, and when the system of disturbance was commenced, to the present day, Ireland has continued in a state of disorder. I omitted, because the disturbances were of less magnitude, adverting to the year 1757, when the Roman Catholic Committee commenced its sittings in Dublin, and the Levellers (the Whiteboys of two years after) entered upon their operations in Cork.

2. I have shown that wherever agrarian disturbance prevailed, political organization soon followed.

3. I have shown that when the rebellion of 1798 was broken up a large multitude remained here, bound by oath to effect the purposes for which they had been organized;—and I have shown that the activity and experience of such conspirators may be discerned in the troubles and in the organization of more recent periods.

4. I have shown that a spirit of religious bigotry has acquired the ascendancy in the insurrectionary systems of modern times.

5. I have reminded you, it was not necessary to prove, that the Roman Catholic peasantry in Ireland feel no attachment, as of duty, and have no sense of conscientious obligation binding them to obey the laws.

6. I have reminded you that, so far as a sense of honour operates upon them, it is manifested in disloyalty to the state.

7. I have shown also that the ecclesiastics, from whom the moral notions of their flocks must naturally have been acquired, were, until of late, concealed enemies to the British Sovereign, and are now rather partakers in the people's sentiments than their instructors in better.

8. I have reminded you also that a people who pretend to seek nothing by their insurrectionary movements and their crimes, but an improvement in their domestic condition—abatement of rent, increase of wages, temporal comforts—have selected as their organ, obey as their director, and magnificently recompense as their agent, a man, who has never exerted himself for even one of the objects which they profess to desire;—and I ask now, whether keeping in mind that the Irish people,—the Roman Catholics I mean, —surrounded by the remembrances of national overthrow, and of what they esteem individual wrong—opposed to England by religious prejudice, by national feeling, by a galling sense of forfeitures and confiscations, and having all these feelings exasperated by a poverty which reminds them that they may play a bold game, for they have nothing but a wretched life to hazard—whether, I say, keeping in mind such circumstances as these, it is rash to affirm that the alleged are not the real grounds of insurrection, and that the disturbances in rural districts are sallies and skirmishes, the preludes of what will be a war, if ever the day arrive when war can be waged with advantage?

Let the correctness of this principle be tested in the solution of difficulties. For example. A gallant General, Sir Hussey Vivian, has expressed his amazement* at the indifference to crime, and the insensibility of conscience to the guilt of murder, which he regards as a characteristic of the disorders prevailing in Ireland,

* Select Committee on Ireland, 1832.

a characteristic which, peculiar and abominable as all must pronounce it to be, he confessed himself unable to understand or explain. It admits of however, an explanation, and but one: the atrocities committed in these disturbances are not, as they have been called, " driftless and desultory;" they are incidents in a systematic war—a war which is wasting the country by slow combustion; or they are punishments inflicted by competent and acknowledged authority. Conscience is no more concerned in them than in the case of a public execution, or in the crowning charge at Waterloo. What to the uninstructed seem assassinations or perjuries, are, to the organized peasantry in Ireland, no worse than just judgments or successful ambuscades and military stratagem. With this admission, the gallant general can understand the phenomenon which has so amazed him—without such an admission it will scarcely admit of explanation.(H)

I come now to my second proposition, that " the great obstacle to the successful progress of this war exists in the moral and physical force of the combined Protestants, especially in Ulster," My observations on this subject must be, to some extent, influenced by a manifesto contained in a recent epistle from Mr. O'Connell, an epistle which bears testimony to the rage awakened by the aspect of Protestant union, in those whose designs it serves to frustrate. Few testimonies could prove more convincingly the importance of the late proceedings of Irish Protestants, than the vehement indignation which it seems to have lighted up in this persevering enemy of the church, whose establishment he swore not to disturb. It is reported that at the Clare election Mr. O'Connell observed, in explanation of a most intemperate and coarse reply to a speech of Mr. Vesey Fitzgerald, his competitor—" It was the best election speech I ever heard, so I took to the tomahawk." I cannot vouch for the truth of this report, but it has the merit of being characteristic. The noble and distinguished individuals who attended at the late Protestant meeting may feel well assured that they would not have been greeted with Mr. O'Connell's unmeasured vituperation, if their presence had not been very serviceable to the cause they are defending.

But there is a Protestant union of long standing, and of long-tried efficacy, which has also done much to merit the agitator's disorderly invective. The Orangemen of Ireland are the special objects of his hate and his denunciation; he courted them, and they would not listen to his solicitations; he inveighed against them, and they disregarded his reviling; his blandishments and ribaldry he found equally unavailing to shake them from their stedfast purpose; and now, that, associated with power and arrayed in authority, he boasts himself a ministerial man, and promises in one breath that he will put down the Orangemen and repeal the union, I am much mistaken if they will not hear his menaces with the same unshaken resolution as they rejected his proffers of delusive friendship, and listened to his defamation. (I)

I hesitate not to affirm, that never did there exist in Ireland a body of comparatively recent institution, to whom the country owes so deep obligation as to the loyal, and discountenanced, and calumniated Orange Society; and I must say, that when its character can be learned in the condition of the districts where its influence is most felt—when it can be learned in the character of those distinguished personages who adorn its meetings and conduct its affairs—whose private worth has universal acknowledgment and defies scrutiny—when its character can be inferred from the notorious predilections of those whose malignant hostility it has a proud consciousness of having merited; I must say, that it is a most unworthy return, on the part of many who, here and in England, hold high station, that they will yield themselves ready hearers to the basest calumnies, and forget their duty to that body, to which, under God, it is owing, that the rebellion of 1798 was not successful, and that England was not smitten down under the combined hostilities of war and treason.

The enemies of Protestantism say,—the Orange Institution is calculated to excite bad feelings, and to provoke tumult and aggression—the Orange Institution replies—by the tranquillity of Ulster. In ancient days, when one who had done Rome service was falsely accused, he pointed to the capitol; and the memory of the good he achieved was sufficient to effect his exculpation.

The Orangemen do more—they say, we saved the country in the hour of its sorest peril—and we have preserved the districts where our organization is effective, against the disorders which affright and afflict the less guarded provinces.

This defence ought to be understood—the merchant on 'Change should ask, why are lands, in Ulster, of higher purchase than in other parts of Ireland? Why does capital find there a more secure investment? The economist in the House of Commons should enquire, why, in the estimate for our military establishments, judging of charges by the distribution of the troops, Ulster, containing much more than a fourth of the population of Ireland, puts the empire to not one-twelfth of the expense? I believe we have twenty-five regiments in Ireland; there are two of them in Ulster. The man of moral and religious principles should enquire, why it is that violent deaths are so few, that the calendar of crime in Ulster is so light in comparison with other Irish circuits, perhaps, I might say, in comparison with England;—and if it be found, that the districts where there is least crime, most security, and smallest expense caused to the state in extending to the subjects the benefit of real protection, are the districts in which Orangeism is most prevalent—a disposition should be awakened, not of course to receive the allegations of Orangemen as truth; but not to give instant and implicit credence to charges against them, resting on no better evidence than the invectives of their enemies.

My Lord, I have studied the history of the Orange Society in the writings of its defamers. I have scrupulously examined its professions of principle; and I have seen its effects. I was not always favourably disposed towards it. Calumny has been very industrious in its endeavours to raise an ill report of the institution; and because of what must be pronounced a culpable remissness in the forbearance with which slanders were suffered to circulate unregarded, they have been unhappily successful. But he who considers, that until the Orange Society was instituted, Ulster was the province in Ireland most harassed by sedition and disturbance, the province which first called for that severest exercise of power, the application of the Insurrection Act; and

who, after reading the debates in parliament,—the grave censures and warnings of the judicial bench, and the accusing testimonies of history, looks out now upon the condition of the province which was once so afflicted and disgraced,—consults the Parliamentary Reports, and finds no severe statute enacted against Ulster—follows judges in their Northern circuits, and hears them speaking congratulations on the prosperity and order of the districts through which they pass, and on the lightness of the criminal calendars,—he will not hastily pronounce that the Orange Society, which arose when Ulster was in a state of the wildest and most destructive commotion, and beneath which that Province has enjoyed forty years of unbroken and unexampled peace, must, nevertheless, be reputed a minister to disorder. If he find, that in the very year in which the Orange Institution struggled into existence, more cold-blooded crimes were committed in a single county in Ulster than have disgraced the nine counties of that Province during the five and thirty years of its strength, he will not admit without examination, that, notwithstanding, it is justly reputed the parent of conspiracy and crime.

It has been said, that the Orange has given occasion to counter associations, and is, therefore, if for no other reason, deserving of reprehension. What are the societies which it has summoned into existence? Mr. O'Connell answers:—The Ribbon Society, a continuance of Defenderism, was instituted to resist Orangeism. This might be plausible, if there were not testimonies in abundance, that the Defenders were organized and armed, and sworn to be true to France, long before an Orange Lodge was formed; testimonies, not of historians favourable to the Protestant cause, but of such unsuspicious witnesses, as Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop in Dublin; Mr. Emmett, an acknowledged conspirator against the British government; Wolfe Tone, the conductor of French invasion upon our shores; Mr. Plowden, a Roman Catholic historian; and others equally unexceptionable. Did the Orange Society call the United Irishmen into existence? No. Before the first Orange Lodge was formed, the organization of treason was complete—its purposes settled and defined, and its emissaries sent forth to invite foreign assist-

ance in the war which was to be waged against England. The Roman Catholic Defenders and the Republican United Irishmen had joined their forces, and had been admitted to the benefits of French fraternization, before Orangeism arose to maintain the cause of order and religion, and to guard the integrity of the empire. (K)

We are not, therefore, surprised that calumny should persevere; but we have some reason to marvel, that it should be graced by so little variety. Indeed, the topic upon which accusers in modern times mainly insist, is furnished by a document which cannot, on any plausible hypothesis, avail them. In the month of December, in the year 1795, Lord Gosford, the governor of Armagh, delivered to the assembled magistrates of the county an address, in which he complained forcibly of a system of persecution under which the Roman Catholics were suffering; and proposed resolutions appointing a committee to inquire into the disorders he denounced, and to bring offenders to justice. This is the speech, these the resolutions, to which, now, public attention is directed, as criminating the Orange Institution. Upon what grounds? Are Orangemen once named in his Lordship's address? Were the offences of which he complained in any instance traced up to the Orange Society? Was any stigma set upon it by the expressed disapprobation of those who assisted his Lordship in conducting the inquiries? No! We have proofs that the disorders condemned had been flagrant before Orangeism had existence. We have no proof that Orangemen were concerned in them. We know that at the time of Lord Gosford's speech, the Society was rather thought of than formed. We know that it was such a state of things as he described which created the necessity for its formation. We know, that individuals most active in correcting the evils of which he complained, who subscribed his resolutions, who assisted in prosecuting the inquiries he directed, became thus influenced, to be the patrons and protectors of the infant Orange institution. We know further, that they were not unwise in taking upon themselves such an office; that events vindicated the wisdom of their decision; and that the province which was mournfully conspicuous for crime and disorder, and treason, at

the time when the Orange institution was framed, and for dark years preceding, has been from the period of its establishment, still more distinguished for loyal virtues, and for domestic peacefulness and security. (L)

But, what proof have we of this? The testimony of a witness, in such an instance assuredly beyond suspicion; we have the evidence of Mr. Plowden, who charged upon the Orangemen the very crimes and disorders by which they had long seen the country distracted, and were at length compelled to associate; who did not scruple to affirm that they were bound together by engagements antisocial and abominable; and who, with that providential indiscretion in which false accusers are often betrayed to confute themselves, in the same pages in which he pronounced that the Orange system exacted an oath of extermination, had the hardihood to affirm, that "the Marquess of Hertford, the Marquess of Abercorn, Lord Northland, the Earl of Londonderry, Mr. Cope, Messrs. Brownlow and Richardson, members for Armagh, and other possessors of great landed estates in Ulster," "insisted on their tenants and labourers becoming members."

It was quite in the nature of things to expect that such an Institution should be grossly calumniated. It arrested the progress of treasonable societies—it afforded a protection against the terrors and the crimes in which their strength consisted. As scattered individuals, it was scarcely possible for men circumstanced as the people of Ulster were, to withstand the terrors of Defenderism, and the solicitations to become members of United Irish lodges. Wherever they went on the business of their ordinary callings—to fair or market, or funeral, or public worship—wherever their avocations rendered it probable that they should be found, in numbers not sufficient to ensure them protection, they were waylaid and ill-treated. They saw that their enemies seemed to know each other, as if by magic, while they were without bond of union or means of recognition; and they often suffered from the power of their assailants to act in concert, when, if they had possessed a similar power, they could have successfully resisted. The industry of the propagators of treason availed itself of such advantages, and many a man was drawn into their confederacy, whose prin-

ciples were adverse to their views, and who merely sought protection from persecutions unceasing and intolerable. In this state of things, the Orange Lodges became a means of uniting together the well-affected—of showing Protestants how loyalty and protection could be reconciled, and of thus rescuing from the artifice of the ill-designing, numbers who might otherwise have been their victims. (M) Naturally, then, the Orange Institution must provoke enmity from all who hate England and her cause; and, as treason had its military organization for the day of battle, it had also its provision of slanderers and false swearers, and its unscrupulous press, to act upon the hate and fears of Roman Catholics, and on the honorable feelings of unsuspecting Protestants, and to render odious an institution which would never have provoked such calumny if it had been less serviceable to the country. (N)

Similar calumnies have been similarly provoked in this our day, and against them also, if such were necessary, we are provided with an equally cogent refutation. What man will believe that the exalted individuals who have joined the Orange Institution of late years, would have given their names or countenance to any system which maintained an unchristian or anti-social rule of action? It would be inexcusable to give heed, without examination, to a slander which men, like Lords Winchilsea, Mandeville, and Bandon declare, after full inquiry, to be false; and to which they give the noblest refutation by enrolling their honored names in the books of the calumniated body. (O)

The Orange Society can claim other testimony in its favor. The institution has shared the common lot of numbering among its members men who have not been faithful to their engagements. The proceedings of its lodges have been made known. If, in old times, Lord Gosford instituted a severe scrutiny, we cannot suppose that the inquiry fell into inadequate hands when Lord Plunket became the inquisitor. No man will question the noble Lord's ability to probe deeply—no man, not even his worst enemy, will suspect him of any such weakness as might be denominated mercy or forbearance—and yet, with every motive that could stimulate to vindictive action, with instruments at his command who had betrayed their party, and who, if they could prove any ill

of the system, would have eagerly justified the treachery—with all the aids of government influence, and the voluntary assistance which the enemies of Protestantism were prompt to afford—the Orange System, pure and spotless as it was, not a single unsoundness indicated, the malignant scrutiny of its enemies defeated by the rectitude of its principles, came forth from the ordeal unhurt, and the smell of the fire had not passed upon it. (P)

I ask pardon for having thus long detained you;—the perseverance with which slander has exerted itself against the Orange Institution, rendered it necessary to expose, for those not acquainted with it, the foul misrepresentations by which it has been defamed. It certainly has merited richly the honor of such misrepresentations. It was made an instrument to save the country in 1798, and to preserve the tranquillity of Ulster since that melancholy period. So great was the change it effected in a few troubled years, that in the year 1803, when Mr. Russell attempted to excite commotion, notwithstanding his popularity and talents, his project utterly failed, and, as Mr. Plowden writes, "such was the unassailable loyalty of the north, heretofore considered the hot-bed of disaffection, that, during that whole time, he was not able to muster more than fourteen of the most abject cast, some abandoned drunkards and others, idiots and mad." Is it wonderful that a system which could effect a change like this should provoke slander—and should scorn it? (Q)

I could, if time admitted, show more clearly and fully how this admirable institution guarded for many years the tranquillity which is the high distinction of Ulster. But I am forced to be brief; and, passing from 1803 over an interval (a tranquil interval) of five-and-twenty years, proceed to show the spirit and temper in which that tranquillity has always been protected.

The mission of Mr. Lawless to the north, and the temper in which it was undertaken, are well remembered; when, with a mass of followers, consisting of one hundred and forty-four thousand men, he advanced to enter the "Black North," as Mr. Wyse, the historian, and a distinguished member, of the Roman Catholic Association, informs us. From Mr. Wyse, also, we may

derive information as to the power which assembled, and the spirit which animated these tumultuary gatherings, in his acknowledgment that "many felt a great repugnance to this summons" (to attend what were called reconciliation meetings;) "but the secret combination law of the county of Tipperary" (it is of the Clonmel meetings Mr. Wyse is writing) "was so well known and so deeply dreaded, that they have been drawn even from remote parts of the counties of Waterford and Limerick, to appear at these assemblages;" and in his account also, of the reception which Mr. O'Connell's hypothetical menace received of driving Protestants into the sea. It "was said in the warmth and hastiness of the moment, a sort of rhetorical apostrophe, not intended to go beyond mere rhetoric; but the shout, or rather the thunder of fierce voices which was simultaneously sent back, spoke volumes of dread and danger. The commission from the Marquess of Anglesey was forgotten; the *if* was forgotten; they already imagined themselves in full pursuit. Nothing was remembered but O'Connell and his hundred thousand men." Other intimations of evil purpose Mr. Wyse has recorded as afforded at these meetings. "When will he call us out? was more than once heard in the streets of Clonmel, during the great provincial meeting of last August; and frequently answered with the finger on the mouth, and a significant smile and wink from the bystanders."

Thus collected and thus disposed, "a hundred and forty-four thousand men" accompanied Mr. Lawless to the town of Ballybay; and a large military force, headed by a general whom Sir Robert Peel has styled, "bravest of the brave," and who may be said to deserve the epithet, if gallantry in the field is the better part of valour, waited on this mighty multitude. It is even said that the brave commander (I mean of his Majesty's forces) solicited a free passage for the great army of the association. Three thousand Orangemen, whose numbers soon increased to five thousand, resolved to contest the passage. They had fears which brave men may entertain, but a resolution which was not to be overcome so long as life enabled them to maintain it. I pass from the subject, because it is one on which there is a difficulty of

speaking with the necessary calmness; but I cannot leave it without affirming, that if Mr. Samuel Gray, the civilian who directed the course which the Orangemen pursued on that most eventful occasion, had not been possessed of more wisdom than the gallant general who undertook to give him advice; and if he had not, relying on the heroic resolution of the little band assembled to guard their homes from pillage and profanation, denied any passage to a barbarous multitude, except such as they could make in the face of Protestant resistance and over Protestant carcasses, that day would have been the beginning of evils in the north; and ferocious excesses would have been, perhaps for long years after, the curse of Ulster. Whatever there was of bad and vindictive feeling would have been called into action by the communications of those whose terror had been felt in the southern districts; and, as the resistance would have been spirited, the destruction would have been incalculable. Better than the general, Mr. Gray knew this; —and he is well entitled to the praise he has received, it is scarcely too much to say, for having prevented an insurrection, and for having effected this great object without dishonouring his triumph by the commission of a single excess. (R)

The expedition of Mr. Lawless failed—the North was not to be terrified;—perhaps it might be agitated. An agitator was announced to enact his part in Dungannon. The Orange Lodges assembled to form a portion of his audience, and he found it expedient to depart. No performance. He appeared in Armagh —but the Orangemen also appeared—another disappointment. Did any violence mar these triumphs? Not the slightest. No, nor the slightest ill will—not even personal dislike to the learned individual whose operations were thus peacefully impeded.. On the contrary, he is well esteemed by many Orangemen, and has, on more than one occasion, successfully, and to their great satisfaction, been employed as counsel on their behalf. But they knew the perilous consequences of agitation—they saw them in the state of the South; and while they never interfered to prevent assemblages or processions, or commemorations of the Roman Catholics among whom they lived, they were resolved that the spirit of Munster disturbance should not be free to introduce

amongst them its sanguinary code of law, and its discipline of assassination.

Difficulties which Government esteemed of more moment have tested and proved that Orangeism is of noble temper. It is needless to say that the members of that body were dissatisfied at the concessions made in 1829, and at the manner in which, according to the confession of Government, they were extorted. It was said that principle was yielded in order to prevent civil war; and yet, how short a time elapsed before the elements of war were set in motion! The period of the agitation which responded to the violent separation of Belgium from Holland—the period of the new Volunteers—the liberators,—is too recent to need reminding you of its character, or of the intention to have arms as well as organization among the champions of repeal; an intention, which, if we are to credit intelligence from all parties, has now been completely carried into effect. I will read but one passage, which may serve to show those who had not previously observed, and to bring freshly into the minds of those who had, the spirit of the time of which I am speaking. "I told them further," said Mr. Steele, at a meeting of the Irish Volunteer Society, "that they knew well, if O'Connell wanted troops I would be the first to bid them go cut pike handles, not in Cratloe woods, but in my own woods of Lough O'Connell. But he had commanded peace." This peace, dependent upon the will of Mr. O'Connell, was not what our government desired. They did not wish to see the boast of that gentleman realised, that Ireland should become a "camp of volunteers"—a camp of which Mr. O'Connell might be head, in the peaceful activity of a Judge Advocate, but where there could be found, (among some of the legacies from the struggles of 1798, who had been invited into it,) more efficient men at arms. The Irish Government did not, with a contented mind, anticipate the suspension of their functions which the contemplated organization would produce, and they sought succour—where?—will unprejudiced men believe it?—From the Orange Yeomanry of Ireland. To them they looked in their day of trouble; and these calumniated men, forgetting all their wrongs in the emergency that demanded their service,

responded to the call;—and had afterwards the barren satisfaction of learning from the public press that the Secretary for Ireland, a cabinet minister, acknowledged the good they had done, and confessed that they had prevented insurrection.

I have said Orange Yeomanry. It is necessary that I should explain the juxta position of the terms. The Irish Yeomanry were embodied in the year 1796. Much opposition was made to their first organization, and when opposition was overcome, efforts were made to derange the system, by leavening it with members who held republican principles. Soon this evil became so notorious that members of the same corps distrusted each other, and knew not whether, in the day of battle, their peril would be greater from the enemy before, than from the treacherous comrade at their side. Such a state of things could not continue long, and the result was, that the engagements of the Orange Institution were resorted to, for the purpose of affording additional security against the treachery of pretended loyalists. At that time an oath was administered to each candidate for admission into the Orange Society, and an oath, it was thought, afforded security. Men trained up in Protestant principles were willing to rely upon it. They had no knowledge of the scorn with which such obligations have been trampled on of late years, or of the casuistry by which they have been vitiated.

It is, perhaps, one of the worst consequences, in a moral point of view, resulting from the concessions in 1829, that they have made England acquainted in high places with what seems perfidy and equivocation. Why did the framers of the "healing measure" introduce that sacrilegious mockery of an oath, taken only to be evaded? Did they not know that they could not by any contrivance reach the conscience of one who dared not exercise a right of private judgment? Did they not know that, according to the principles of the church of Rome, not the individual, but the church, was the keeper of conscience, and that any obligation inconsistent with ecclesiastical interests, however it may have been sanctioned, was of a kind which should not be regarded? Did they not know that reverence for such an obligation was criminal; for that, in the words of a general council,

engagements "should not be regarded as oaths, but perjuries rather, which were prejudicial to the church?" Did they not know, therefore, that the conduct of Roman Catholic electors and Roman Catholic members of Parliament must be, so far as the principles of their church prevailed, exactly what it has been? Did they not know, also, that although casuists could explain the Jesuitical justice of taking an oath with mental reservation, and with purpose to break it—Englishmen, educated in simpler habits, could not understand the dishonourable propriety. And why would they habituate Protestants to the thought, that, in what are called the highest estates, men shall advance their interests by the open and undisguised perpetration of an act in which, if humble villians be detected, they are advanced to the pillory?(S)

It was wrong to familiarise the people of England and the Protestants here to acts which they regard as unpunished crimes, and on which their upright education has wholly incapacitated them from fixing a sufficiently liberal construction.

I come to my third proposition:—"The conduct of Government is calculated to weaken, and, if not counteracted, ultimately to destroy a power to which, humanly speaking, Ulster is indebted for tranquillity, and the other provinces for that degree of security (however imperfect) which the union with Great Britain is enabled to extend to them. The Orange system is the first object against which the hostility of the Government is directed. It has been objected against, not alone because of its effects, but also on the ground of general principle. On general principle it has been contended, that all secret societies should be prohibited by a well ordered Government. By the way, it should be always borne in mind, that in the Orange Society there is nothing secret, with the single exception of the signs to aid mutual recognition. But, to consider the abstract principle as applicable even to such secrecy, I am quite free to admit its justice. Under a well-ordered Government—a government which affords protection to the subject, and enforces obedience to good laws—no secret society, having an exclusive character, and contemplating a political object, should be tolerated. In such a state of things, among the Protestants of Ireland no such society would have been formed.

But if a government be supine, or if the laws are found ineffectual; if a constitution, which is native to Protestant England, be transplanted to an uncongenial climate and soil; if laws, which are good when they have every subject for their willing minister, are to be the laws where all but one description of subjects hold them in disesteem, and strive to render them inoperative; if laws which have been adapted to the sincerity of Protestant principle, are given as the rule of conduct where, except in so far as an honest heart resists the influence of a pernicious system, perjury may be accounted a duty,—disobedience to the state a virtue—and where one of the first services a subject owes, incurs a brand of ineffaceable dishonor; if the laws and regulations which have been effectual in peaceful England are therefore adopted for the colony with which she garrisons hostile Ireland; and if these laws and the free constitution they distinguish are found ineffectual to protect the obedient and to punish crime; it follows, of necessity, that either the guilty must go unpunished—the good must be perverted or destroyed—or else the inadequacy of law must be compensated by private endeavour, and good subjects must enter into societies, to procure for one another the support and protection which government is incapable of extending to them.

In such a state of things associations of a defensive character will be justified on the same principle by which my Reverend Brethren and myself are excused, namely, necessity, for taking part in political proceedings. I can truly say, that I have occupations and studies in which I have found as close an approach to happiness as human condition admits, and that I interrupt them to concern myself in pursuits to which a sense of the general danger of the country, and a feeling of duty, alone, can reconcile me.

But if general considerations of the inadequacy, or the ineffectual administration of law, justify proceedings which, under other circumstances, should be forbidden—if, from a consideration of the dangers, to meet which the Orange Institution was formed, you account the framers of the system justified,—what are the arguments by which power is now justified in violently breaking that system down? What is the state of the country? A con-

federacy exists, co-extensive almost with the Roman Catholic population, to extirpate Protestantism and effect a separation from England. What is the power of the law?—The massacre at Carrickshock—the Kilkenny Assizes, (where the Attorney-General declined to prosecute, because, as he had the pain to confess, intimidation had rendered it impossible to procure justice,) painfully instruct you. What is the disposition of the legislature to enact laws suitable to the circumstances which require them? The convulsions in the cabinet—the permission—a permission rendered by the signs of the times compulsion—which assembles us here, give the mortifying answer. What is the power of government to enforce the laws which exist? We learn it in the astounding declaration of the Lord Chancellor of England, of the noble Lord, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, that the King cannot fulfil the solemn duty to which his coronation oath especially binds him—a duty, the fulfilment of which is not an implied, but an express condition, on which his title to retain the sceptre of British Sovereignty depends. Is it in such a state of things, when government may almost be said to have abdicated its functions, that, with the last effort of expiring power, it calls upon the Orangemen to disperse, and leave the loyal Protestants of Ireland naked before their enemies?

And at what a time is the defence of Protestantism thus dismantled? When the "People of Ireland (as that suffering organ of loyalty, the *Pilot*, pronounces, and we know whom he means by "the People,") are of one mind, organized, concentrated, body and soul, for national independence. "We," the *Pilot* continues, "bide our time—we know our strength. The Irish nation reminds us of a well disciplined regiment, billeted in a country town. One blast of a trumpet—the scattered, the apparently listless, are in a moment ON PARADE. Every man knows his proper place, his cause, his just objects, and his real enemies." Who are these enemies? Mr. O'Connell, declaring himself a Ministerialist—declaring that all agitation must be so conducted as not to embarrass the Government which he numbers among his clients—Mr. O'Connell thus disposed, thus associated, declares that there are two parties in Ireland—the Repealers, who

are the people, and their opponents, whom he styles Orangemen; and he cries out, "The Orangemen must be put down." Why? Let Englishmen hear it. Let it be told to the son of George III. Let him hear it, who has sworn that he will defend the right, and who is not of a race that would abandon the just cause of persecuted men, because the false-hearted have forsaken them and they are despitefully used and entreated. What is the offence which brings down the wrath of Mr. O'Connell, and the severity of his associates, the King's ministers, upon them? What is their crime? They will not join in the outcry against the afflicted ministers of a Protestant church. They will not unite in the clamour or the violence by which the "national independence" is to be extorted; and for this, such is the state of the Government and the times, for this Mr. O'Connell declares that the Orangemen must be put down—for this he demands that their gentry shall be affronted and stripped of power, and that their yeomanry shall be disarmed.

Why—why is this? Where shall be found the body to whose discretion arms could be more safely entrusted? Where the body by whose valour they were better deserved? Will posterity believe the statement, that, at the same time, the Roman Catholic population of Ireland was confessed to be as a well disciplined regiment—all organized, concentrated, body and soul, for national independence, or, in other words, to effect a total separation from England; and the British government, on its own responsibility—parliament adjourned—called on the Protestant yeomanry to surrender their arms? Will posterity believe that a King sat upon the throne of England, of the House of Hanover, a son of George the Third—pledged by the obligation of a sacred oath;—who had heard, under most solemn circumstances, the question, "Will you to the utmost of your ability maintain to the clergy of the United Church of England and Ireland their rights?" and had answered, as Protestants answer, in sincerity, "I will;" and that while he reigned, in the full possession of his bodily and mental faculties, he saw his ministers courting the patronage of a man who organized boastfully all instruments by which these rights could be defeated; and who so licentiously exercised his

triumph over Protestants that he pronounced it a crime in any to have such respect to conscience as to oppose his measures of spoliation? "The Orangeists," he exclaims, "have rallied to sustain that most odious impost." This is their crime. They have rallied to uphold the law; they are willing to pay the debts which they contracted. Base is the knave that pays! They must be put down; so must tithes—for Mr. O'Connell feels strongly "that Roman Catholics have this game completely in their hands; and that if the tithes are now extinguished, the moral effect of such a victory over the Orange faction would be to destroy their power for ever." He is not widely astray. If the church establishment be broken down, the Protestant or Orange Magistrates, as Mr. O'Connell requires, cashiered, and the yeomanry left without means of defence; and if the well-disciplined regiments have patience enough "to bide their time" a little longer—unpunished murders, emigration, and despondence will soon so thin the ranks of England's friends, that separation may be won without a battle. The Protestants will cease to occasion annoyance to the ministry. "This Irish brigade," said a French monarch, "gives me more trouble than any regiment in my service." "Sire," said their commander, "your Majesty's enemies make the same complaint." Complaints, if matters proceed much farther in their present course, will soon cease to be made of Irish Protestants; and then England and his Majesty will learn, as truly as the well disciplined regiment of the *Pilot*, to "know their real enemies."

We are no longer at a loss to comprehend the nature and design of those proceedings which have of late days occasioned to the Protestants of Ireland so much anxiety and alarm. Mr. O'Connell's letters throw a dreadful light upon them. He demands the best offering England can offer; and to purchase a temporary cessation of his hostilities; to purchase brief freedom from the embarrassments he can occasion, he must be at any price propitiated. Now we can understand the entire procedure by which we have arrived at our present estate. An individual, who has shown his consistency in nothing so remarkably as in his persevering support of measures injurious to the

Protestant cause, is set in authority over Protestant Magistrates. The individual who organized the new volunteers, and who has sworn that he will never accept a favour from the British ministry, (you may find the record of his solemn oath in the prints of the day,) until a parliament holds its first sitting in College-green; an individual who did more to bring the law into contempt than any man living or dead—is found guilty of a grave offence, and, as his punishment, obtains high promotion in his profession; he pronounces national faith a farce, and is installed in a dictatorship over the King's ministers. Magistrates are persecuted with Italian-like inquisitions—menaced with shadowy and fleeting accusations; and are dismissed by a government who challenge public inquiry in adopting the form of open trial, and cannot make up their minds to dare public judgment by declaring the name of the offence they punish.

But, indeed, from the day when Lord Grey disclosed the principle on which he had selected the high functionary who was to exercise authority over them, our magistrates should have been prepared for severity.

I acknowledge that it is bad taste to occupy your time with any notice of that noble and learned individual, the Lord Chancellor for Ireland; and I would not speak of him if I did not regard his appointment as one of those acts which Protestants have strong reason to number among their grievances.

Lord Grey, it will be remembered, promoted the noble Lord expressly on the ground of his political merits, his experience of Ireland and his popularity; that is to say, expressly because of the opinions he entertained, and the dispositions he had manifested in the politics of this country, and because of the party with which he was popular. (T) Now, I would defy any friend of the noble and learned Lord to mention one act of his which proved that he had a correct knowledge of the people of Ireland, a correct knowledge even of the Roman Catholics. Remember his two attempts at legislation—his tithe leasing bill, of which the provisions were never, in even a single instance, adopted; his burial bill, on the success of which he staked his reputation, which, he pledged himself, would give satisfaction, as he confessed it ought,

to the Roman Catholic people of Ireland. They scorned it. A year had scarcely passed away when ecclesiastics of the Church of Rome in Ireland expressed, before parliamentary committees, their contempt of the measure, and their resolution not to adopt it. It could not be, then, for his knowledge of the people, in the ordinary sense of the terms, the noble Lord was promoted.

But what were the recollections by which the Protestants of Ireland saw him placed on the Chancery Bench? Some years previously, and nearly at the same time, two conspiracies were detected in this country;—one was a conspiracy to testify Protestant displeasure at the disrespect shown by the Viceroy to the memory of William III., and to testify this upon the occasion of the Lord Lieutenant's first appearance at the theatre. I do not wish to palliate the guilt which may attach to this procedure, or to conceal the fact, that a bottle was said to have been thrown on the stage,—of which, however, there were strong doubts,—and that a watchman's rattle was said to have struck the pannel of a side box, near that in which his Excellency was seated. With these outrages, however, the conspiracy was wholly unconnected. Another conspiracy was detected—it had for its object to extirpate Protestantism, and strike off the British yoke. The Lord Chancellor, then Attorney-General, was recalled from his parliamentary duties, from his advocacy of the Roman Catholic cause, from chivalrous assaults on all who hinted that his Dulcinea was not peerless, from repetitions of his solemn assurance to the House of Commons, that there was no religious or political acrimony in the disturbances which harassed Ireland. He was recalled to prosecute for the Ribbon conspiracy—as foul a treason as ever was exposed—and he did prosecute. HE INDICTED THE RIBBONMEN FOR A MISDEMEANOR; HE COMMITTED THE CONSPIRATORS OF THE BOTTLE FOR HIGH TREASON. What was the meaning of this? Was it accident? It would, no doubt, be a mortifying thing to have public attention turned to the trial at Green-street, with the same eagerness as it was attracted by the splendid and vehement protestations in St. Stephen's. There was a convenience in getting up a diversion, in hurrying off the gaping crowds to the imposing burletta, the Sesquipedalian farce of the high

treason committal; and of leaving the stage deserted, where the guilt of those who swore unrelenting hatred to Protestantism, not to care for the moans and groans of old age and dying infants, but to wade knee deep in Orange blood, was cloaked under the judicial charity of a misdemeanor. This would be convenient. This, it might be insinuated, explains the conduct of the learned Lord. I believe his conduct admits, if not a simpler, of a more creditable explanation; that he was not acquainted either with Protestantism, or the system which it reformed. He was not acquainted with the country. His disposition, that solitariness of character which repels sympathy, leaves him exposed to the machinations of those who would turn his errors to account.

But, at all events, conduct like that of the noble Lord betrays his animus towards Protestants. Was he to be appointed Chancellor, political Chancellor, and were not such circumstances as speedily took place to be expected? He was well known, his prosecutions had created a new era in Ireland; the grossness of the procedure towards contrasted parties was too palpable to be overlooked. The Protestants awoke to a sense of their condition and danger; and although the rally was not in time to man the fortresses of the Constitution and protect the Protestant Church from profanation, it was not too late, I trust it was not too late, to secure the Protestant religion from being sacrificed.

Was it wonderful that, when the Magistrates of Ireland were subjected to the power of such a Lord Chancellor—the Protestant Magistrates—they should dread its unequal severity? And what have they experienced? Details seem now unnecessary. Take a single instance.

You all know what the conduct of the government has been in the cases of Colonel Blacker and Colonel Verner. You know that Colonel Blacker received the thanks of Lord Anglesey's government for the act which caused his dismissal by Lord Wellesley. You know well which was the recompense his conduct merited. But I put aside all thought of his deservings.—I will suppose, that upon the investigation into the transactions in which he was concerned, it may have been brought to light that Mrs. Blacker, or some lady in her house, or some servant in her esta-

blishment, was decorated with a badge of Orange disloyalty—I will suppose that Colonel Blacker was proved to have been guilty of some offence. I ask, why was he left unpunished by the law? Why was he not prosecuted in the Court of King's Bench? But, above all, why was not his offence stigmatized, for the warning of his brother magistrates? Circumstances, I am quite aware, may often require that the commission of the peace shall be withdrawn from one whose precise unfitness it would be inconvenient to disclose. In such cases, the government properly and boldly takes upon itself the responsibility of the dismissal, and the public has no title to expect that its inquiries shall be answered. But where the government shrink from responsibility—where they show, by inviting attendance at an open court, that they wish to take the public into a partnership in their procedures—in such a case, I have no hesitation to affirm, they are called upon to state the offence as well as the punishment; and I would add, that the plainer was the evidence of Colonel Blacker's delinquency, the more obvious was the necessity to satisfy Colonel Verner. (U)

What inference could be drawn from the proceedings which have actually taken place, not favorable to the notion that the Protestants were to be mortified? And who are the Magistrates thus dealt with? Who are degraded—so far as government can degrade? Who are denied information?—Adventurers? Men without property or name? Oppressors of the poor? Extortioners, unjust? Absentees?—No; our government fly at high game. Their affronts are offered to men who rank with the highest in every thing which renders an Irish gentleman respectable. As Magistrates, above attaint or suspicion; as landlords, (what relation is more important?) men whom an upright government should single out, and set in honor, for example and imitation.

Except upon such principle as I have imagined, it is most difficult to understand the proceedings to which so many of our best magistrates are subjected. To disgust them that they should resign—to impose upon them mortifying duties, by which their influence might be destroyed—to leave them exposed, by not

stating the offence which had incurred a penalty, to the danger of falling into similar error, was not a conduct to be expected from any government which wished to instruct magistrates in the right, and to countenance them in it. Lord Plunket was Attorney-General when he forbade the magistrates of the County of Cork to enforce the law against a Roman Catholic Priest, who refused to give evidence in the case of a most foul murder: because, as the then Attorney-General said, it might lessen the influence of the Priest with his people if he bore testimony against the murderers. He was Chancellor when Colonel Blacker chose to exercise the influence of a friend rather than the authority of severe law, in causing assembled Orangemen to return to their homes; and for this act of wisdom and indulgence, he is pronounced unfit to hold the commission of the peace.

Colonel Verner, in his place in parliament, enquired of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, whether it was the intention of Government to enquire into the circumstances of a meeting for the Repeal of the Union, at which a magistrate presided, and I believe more than one attended. He was answered in the negative; as, in such attendance or presidency, there was no violation of law—a principle which would imply, that any man who does not deserve a place on the scaffold, or a residence in the hulks, is good enough to be a magistrate in Ireland. But how does this indulgent easiness of Government bristle up into angry defiance and assault, if, not the agitation of the repeal question, but the maintenance of law, or the observance of old custom call for its interference? Captain Graham is prosecuted; Colonel Blacker and the Dean of Tuam are dismissed. This latter gentleman who has been, I believe, more than thirty years a justice of the peace, in acknowledgment of the cheering with which he or his party were greeted, by a crowd who had lighted a bonfire in the streets of Tanderagee, lifted his hat. Was there treason here? He was dismissed; and having received his supersedeas, received subsequently a notice that as an inquiry was to be held in his neighbourhood (on other affairs than his) he might take the opportunity of defending himself against the charge of

which he had already undergone the punishment. It has been said, and much dwelt on, that at that bonfire a magistrate was burnt in effigy. Of this Dean Carter was altogether unaware; and while the charge is made to aggravate the wrong he was accused of doing, no notice seems to have been taken of a circumstance which may have influenced the people to commit the indignity complained of. The magistrate, who was thus in effigy outraged, had incurred, on no light grounds, the displeasure of the people: he had subjected the individuals, on the occasion of whose acquittal the extempore bonfire and its accompaniments were prepared, to what was thought unnecessary hardship and contumely; and he had assaulted and struck a Protestant clergyman. For this he was contented to make an humble apology; but it was not wonderful that an assault of such a nature, of very recent occurrence, should inflame the people. Had such an outrage occurred in any other province in Ireland, and had a Roman Catholic clergyman been the wantonly insulted individual, there would have been we will admit no burning in effigy. All this is omitted in the official notice of the bonfire transaction, and while the magistrate who had broken the law, was absent from the session's bench to appear at the culprits' bar and take his trial, his eulogy was pronounced by the Solicitor-General;—and his brother magistrates were advised to make him their example in the discharge of their onerous duties. This is strange. It may be said that if such an offence as I have named were known to men in authority it would not have been so lightly passed over. One of our complaints is this very ignorance. We cannot accept it as an excuse. All transactions in which Conservatives engage are inspected through a magnifier, to spy out every, the slightest irregularity: is the telescope to be inverted when applied elsewhere, so as to remove from the thoughts and observation of those who occupy place and power, though it cannot from their neighbourhood—the evils of which we complain, and the grounds of the apprehensions which trouble us?

Another instance of this rigorous method of proceeding I should be sorry to omit stating. Certain individuals were tried at Ballygawly, in the county of Tyrone, for appearing at an illegal pro-

cession, and were acquitted. The magistrates in petty sessions were subsequently ordered to have these individuals summoned again, to be tried for the same offence, to be prosecuted by the same persons, and to have produced against them the same corroborating evidence which had previously been given, and notwithstanding which they had been acquitted. Had they been placed upon a second trial, the result, in all probability, would have been a second acquittal, and the bringing down on the magistrates who were instruments in this unprecedented effort of power, the utter disfavor of the people. The magistrates were better advised than to submit. Honor advised them—a sense of justice—the high feeling which characterises men worthy of their place; and their chairman, Sir Hugh Stewart, replied to what seemed to him a gloomy and ill-advised command, that he would not be the instrument of persecution. The case was too gross for an immediate dismissal, and the magistrates yet remain in the commission.

But it was not so much to punish one magistrate and to mortify another, as to create a salutary terror of law, and prevent Orange processions in future, the strong measure of dismissal was resorted to. The greater the consequences expected to follow, the more carefully should the proceedings which ended in punishment be regulated; the more distinctly should the cause of punishment have been made known. We should not have to see in the same act, the secrecy of despotism, and the openness of form by which a free Government wins public confidence and favor.

But it was necessary to strike a terror which should prevent Orange processions. Why should they be prevented? Were all the consequences of concession to be visited in mortification on the Orangemen? Could not the cup of triumph be pledged to a Roman Catholic without flinging its dregs into the Orangeman's face? Was he to be told that the commemoration of liberty gloriously rescued, in which for more than a century his ancestors had indulged, by which his principles in early life had been to no small extent formed, by which the spirit of loyalty, even in maturer years, was kept high in his soul—must be discontinued? Why? Because Mr. O'Connell was in parliament, and the "Boyne

Water" was a party tune. And why for this, must the commemoration be abandoned? Mr. O'Connell, in his evidence before the parliamentary committees acknowledged that Roman Catholics had, so far as pledging the Orange toasts, assisted in the commemoration—that they did so in Dublin was matter of perfect notoriety —it was known in the country parts of Ireland also, that their assistance at processions was matter of frequent occurrence. Why must it then be abandoned, when by admission to the privileges of the constitution, Roman Catholics were bribed to share in the rejoicing. Oh! the processions had become unpopular. Yes. The conduct of government made them so. "When the law," said Mr. O'Connell, in his evidence, " put the Catholics under the protection of government, and we became to a certain degree subjects, the Orange party, with their great and volunteer association going beyond the law, and threatening us beyond it, the toast had an effect which it had not before." Every concession rendered the Roman Catholics more impatient—every display of Protestant principles became an annoyance in the same degree in which there was a hope that it might be prevented, and as soon as government was found willing to yield a ready ear to complaint, complaint was prepared to occupy it.

But the Orange processions were unpopular? I deny it. They were not—until agitation and the yielding temper of the government made them so. There was in the North of Ireland a spirit of mutual toleration and forbearance—Roman Catholics had, what I do not remember in the South, their processions on St. Patrick's Day, which Orangemen never disturbed or molested—and they, in turn, until evil arts turned the passions of the people against them, led forth in peace their July celebrations.

But, say some good, easy people, what can Orangemen lose by giving up these processions, which can do them no good, and by which their neighbours are offended. It is because the processions did them much good these neighbours were taught to take offence. I should like to hear these wise men propose to strip war of its pomp and circumstance, or to take away the stars and blue ribbands, and armorial ensigns, which do nobody any good, and of which some economists deny not only the value, but the

propriety. Then we should be told that such things are necessary to act on the mixed nature of a man, and that by them he is more strongly and purely influenced than by more palpable advantages. And shall the poor only be insulted, and have what constituted the poetry of their life haughtily prohibited to them? Long established customs require to be gently changed. It is well known that laws are more easily altered than customs venerable for antiquity and for the cause with whose remembrance they are associated. A show of kindliness would have won the Orangemen to discontinue even their guiltless processions, and adopt some less objectionable mode of testifying the steadfastness of their principles. But they were to be put down—put down with angry feelings in their hearts—put down with a strong hand. It is fearful to see government thus acting as the bravo of England's most inveterate enemies. I will not speak to you of the state of feeling in which the experiment of Orange coercion was tried, but I do say, that if the worst enemy of British connexion wished for the time when it was likely to be most dangerous—he would have chosen that moment which his Majesty's ministers selected. (V)

But now we no longer marvel at the selection—now it can hardly be doubted, that acts which might have seemed the freaks and caprices of a rash government, or the misfortunes of an embarrassed, had in truth a unity of purpose, and probably the same adviser. Protestant gentry and people are alike discountenanced and discouraged. One class subjected to a chilling regimen of estrangement and suspicion; undervalued at the seat of power, and teazed by base espionage at their residences in the country; the other exposed to all irritating and subduing influences—capricious exercises of authority, mortifications, losses, nightly alarms, conspiracies, deaths. We call ours a free country,—we speak of civil and religious liberty, and are proud to say that we possess it. I, for my part, would not hesitate to affirm, that the annals of the world do not present instances of darker tyrrany than Irish Protestants experience, where they are too few to afford each other protection. It is well remembered that outrage and threatening against Protestants was assigned by

Major Warburton, police inspector, as the cause of extensive emigration among the members of that most interesting colony of Palatines, who had escaped from religious persecution on the continent, and found for a century, until of late years, a happy settlement in Ireland. Many here may remember that inconvenient disclosure which took place at the trials on the late special commission in Maryborough, when, on the cross-examination, a witness swore that she had attended at the chapel that she might win from the priest, by the pretence of being a Roman Catholic, protection for her family. Within the last few years one hundred and twenty thousand Protestants have fled from the persecutions which wasted them here—and they have been suffered to depart without an effort to detain them, and have left no salutary warning to guard against the further diminution of the friends of England. In such a state of things, without effectual organization on the part of the Protestants, have we any right to hope that great evil can be averted? Protestant Magistrates are displaced—Protestant people made the objects of partial and vindictive legislation—Protestant Clergy are deprived of their rights,—and the Ministry who should protect the church, co-operate with the individual who is most resolute to effect its overthrow.

And will England look on while the struggle is coming—will she wait without moving until it is ended? Will she be indifferent when she hears that the Roman Catholic people are organized as one man, as a disciplined regiment, expecting the sound of the trumpet-blast, and ready at a call to rush on their enemies—and will she be satisfied to think that that is the time when England should strike the arms of defence from Protestant hands, or by openly siding with her own unmitigated enemies, sink the hearts of her faithful friends into despair? I do not know—but this I do trust—that we shall never despair. We believe in a power which will befriend and save to the uttermost those who trust in Him. We believe that we shall be victorious, if we faithfully do the duty assigned to us, whatever may be the issue of our efforts here—whatever the manner in which we are summoned home to the crown prepared for the faithful; and I do trust in God we shall discharge that duty well, and even provoke

England to well-doing by the steadiness with which we maintain the right.

Yes, my Lord, I confidently trust that in the worst difficulties we shall acquit ourselves as men whom faith sustains. We may feel it painful to think that our cause has not awakened the quick concern it merits; but we shall stand by it the more resolutely, that it has been forsaken by others. There is One, we know who never will desert his cause or abandon those who put their trust in Him. We shall not be cast down from our dependence on Him. We shall not be untrue to ourselves because frail creatures, like ourselves, may have disappointed our expectations. It is no doubt, matter of amazement and awe, to think of the unprecedented coalition which a British ministry has made, and to witness that portentous dalliance between power and popular fury, on the issue of which so mighty consequences are dependent; but no feelings of amazement should disturb the presence of mind in which we prepare for the coming tempest. The hardy mariner is not confused when dangers threaten him on the deep; but when the stormy wind ariseth, and a horror of thick darkness is on the wave and in the sky, his courage rises with the emergency; and the same great Being who commands the billows to rage and swell, and makes storm and tempest the submissive voice of his power, makes that power equally and more sublimely manifest in the collectedness and composure of the resolved spirit which he conducts in safety through the dangers.

I well remember the deep and ardent emotion with which, many a long year since, I heard the praise of man's patient heroism in a danger of that awful magnitude which causes human power to seem but very weakness.

The subject of encomium was the energy and animation displayed by the crew of a little boat upon which a water-spout was gathering to burst in utter destruction, in preparing to evade the shock or meet it. For some short time he who witnessed the well-ordered activity could not understand its purport; but, when carefully glancing round, he observed a confined circular spot on which there lay a shadow of extreme blackness, within which the waves chafed and raged as things which were tormented, he

comprehended the danger. Directly over this dark circle a dense cloud stooped as it were from on high, and scowled a gloomy fascination over the agitated water. As the cloud descended, the water arose, and the nearer they approached, the mightier seemed the mass of the uplifted pillar, the more appalling its menace. Who could think without deep interest of man's steadfastness in such a peril; who would not rejoice to learn that destruction passed away from him?

And why should we not hope that our faithfulness, seen in sore trouble, may create an interest which danger alone has not had power to awaken. The danger indeed is great. The awful spectacle which denotes confusion, exhibiting the waters below the firmament in immediate contact with the waters which are above, a contact not such as is provided for by the harmonious order of nature; but by which nature is outraged—where that which was set on high comes down from its place, and rests upon, if it do not mingle with, the unstable support it has drawn up into a most fearful elevation—that spectacle is an inadequate type of the perils by which we are menaced. The phenomenon of the water-spout meances here. If England, from her secure tower of watch, turn an eye upon it, let her see faithful Protestantism preparing for the danger; and,—whatever be the part which it shall please her to take,—whether she interpose to prevent the meeting of cloud and sea,—the dreadful confederation of a British Government with men sworn to extirpate her religion, and to shake off her yoke; with the noon-day murderers of Carrickshock and Ballyheigh, and the men who would brave the law rather than testify against them—whether she prevent a confederation of which the first pledge is a sacrifice of the Irish Church, and the second is to be a surrender of national independence—whether to protect life and honour and interest, she interpose to prevent a confederation like this, or wait, until, amidst all dreadful circumstances of crime and devastation, the hurricane union is consummated—let it be our part to accept the clear and full warnings with which we have been favoured, and be, one and all, soul and body, prepared for the event.

At a Meeting of the CONSERVATIVE SOCIETY, held at their Rooms, October 14, 1834.

The Earl of RODEN in the Chair.

I BEG leave before submitting the motion, which it is my intention to propose, to congratulate your lordship and the society on the increasing favor with which the affairs of Protestants are regarded; a result attributable, humanly speaking, to the moderate, I trust I may say Christian spirit, in which our proceedings are regulated, and to the indisputable veracity of our statements. It should not be left unrecorded, as it has not escaped general notice, that the statements of Protestant grievances and perils which have, from time to time, emanated from our society, remain to this day uncontradicted. Those who know the grounds of our complaints and our adversaries' prudence, will not see in this any matter of surprise; but it is not less fitting that we should take note of confessions implied in the silence of those who oppose us, than that, when they are bold enough to make denials, we should be ready to meet them with new arguments or the citation of additional evidence.

It should be observed, also, that the testimony borne by our adversaries' silence is corroborated by their intemperance. Our statements have provoked them to indulge in personal abuse—they have not goaded them into the hazarding a contradiction. (A) Mr. Martin's instructive parallels, his prescient sagacity, have been termed puerile; the vigorous eloquence of Mr. Butt is declamation; Mr. Boyton's luminous and comprehensive survey of evidences, which leave conspiracy without a disguise, is deficient in the fiction required to recommend it to a refined taste. "Boyton," Mr. O'Connell intimates, "is a proser." I had endeavoured to

contribute my share to the common stock, and had laboured to show that the Church of Rome holds oaths of slight account when her interests would suffer from their observance. Mr. O'Connell shows the irrelevancy of such a charge, by congratulating his people on my eternal stupidity, by proclaiming that " the Rev. Speaker was christened by Father Flannery, parish priest of Clonmel," (it does not speak well for the Church of Rome that so excellent and esteemed a man should have been parish priest of Clonmel when I was baptised, and, while bishops are imported from America, should remain parish priest of the same town still) —and that my baptismal name should be spelt in Irish. It is no doubt a matter of deep importance to all whom it may concern, that my name has been mutilated into English, and that I did not sturdily maintain its Milesian grandeur—but I protest, if my acceptance of a name can reconcile Mr. O'Connell to his engagements, the august dimensions of my Hibernian prœnomen, Muiriertach, or in mercy to human organs of speech, the more practicable Moriertagh may be cast into a crucible of etymology—such a one as Goldsmith employed in his resolution of Atoes into Ki, and if it come out not Mortimer, but Daniel, I will not plead the application of the name in modern times as a reason for declining it—I will require only that Mr. O'Connell and his associates keep the oaths they have sworn, not to attempt the subversion or injury of the church establishment. (B) If conscience, my Lord, were not a severer monitor than our worst enemies, I might indulge in a thought of boasting. One who would not spare, seems to have traced back my obscure life from maturity to the cradle; I accept the taunt with which he armed himself, as proof that he found no greater evil.

We, certainly, had no reason to expect that our adversaries were to remain inactive in their warfare against us, simply because they could not deny the truth of our allegations. They have had too long experience of the success which waits upon bold recrimination to be at a loss how they should maintain their cause. Accordingly, they have waged against us an unscrupulous warfare of defamation; they have aspersed our motives, and misrepresented our objects and proceedings:—and yet, if there

be not a more than ordinary indisposition or inability in men's minds to discern truth, I cannot persuade myself to believe that the calumnies launched against us have any power to harm.

Indeed there are circumstances under which I could be induced to suspect that they were the mock assaults of some disguised friend, who wished to fix public attention upon the propriety of our conduct, under the pretence of setting forth the worst things a prudent enemy would think it safe to pronounce. You remember, my Lord, what the charges against us were; how frequently, and with how little variety, they were reiterated. One was, that a member of our society suggested the necessity of Protestants arming themselves, in consequence of the dangers which were coming closely upon them: another was, that a threat was held out of dispossessing from Protestant property tenants in rebellion against the laws. Without entering into the question how little, or whether any, foundation was laid by us for such charges—without attempting to show how totally unlike the sentiments uttered amongst us were those attributed to our members, I would ask, whether it does not bear testimony to our uniform moderation, that calumny could not hope to have worse charges believed; and, whether it does not also betray the indiscreet insolence of triumph in our opponents, that they shall accuse Protestants, (as if it were an unpardonable offence,) of designing to arm themselves against murderous assaults, or to clear their properties of tenants who will not observe, or suffer others to observe, the conditions of their occupancy? A conspiracy has been entered into by men who swear that they will wade in our blood. In the confessed inability of government to break up this detestable association, would it be very criminal to say, that you should be provided to defend yourselves? Mr. O'Connell threatens the gentry, that if they do not abandon their clergy to a people thus confederated, if they take upon themselves the payment of tithe, requiring nothing more of their tenants than to observe the terms of their occupation, they will draw upon themselves the animosity to which the ministers of their religion have been victims, and will be set at defiance by their tenantry. When such a character is given of a certain class of tenants by such a man, is it criminal

to say that a prudent landlord should not hold out to them strong encouragement? Accusations which have such crimes for their subject are characteristic alike of the accuser, and of the party against which they are preferred. It is certainly instructive, that at a time when an associate of the government may teach knaves how they can evade payment of a just debt—may threaten good men that they must not aid in its recovery—if a gentleman say that he will eject from his property those who wickedly conspire against his rights, the defence to which he has been driven by fraud and violence, shall be charged upon him as an oppression.

But the calumnies now advanced against us by the government press will not impart their full instruction until they have been compared with the language held, a few years since, by the same censors. I scarcely feel myself justified in taking it for granted that you retain a distinct remembrance of the state of this country when the Marquess of Anglesey, for the second time, arrived here as our governor. I have been reproved for not carrying my retrospect of censure farther back than the accession of Earl Grey's ministry. The reproof must be respected, for it comes from one who, as a scholar, a man of independence, of eloquence, and ability, occupies that place in the British press assigned to the recognized successor of Addison and Burke, and Johnson and Coleridge, and those other eminent men who have connected the daily press of England with the highest order of our literature. And yet, however deeply my respect for the editor of the *Standard* must cause me to regret any dissent from his opinion, and however fully I agree with him that the Tory predecessors of Earl Grey were betrayed into grievous error in their policy towards Ireland, I feel that our difficulties and dangers have so multiplied of late years, that the misgovernment of former administrations, (subsequently to the year 1829,) seems to lose its character of error and injustice when viewed in comparison with the conduct of our present rulers. I therefore confine myself within narrower limits, and propose to bring to your remembrance the state of Ireland when Lord Anglesey, for the second time, came amongst us.

I do not expect that you should bear a distinct recollection of it, for in truth events have followed each other up, in so rapid succession, and of so marked a character, that they have, as it were, spread out three troubled years over the space which, in quiet times, twenty would have covered, and have put back the years preceding into indistinctness and uncertainty. If time be measured by the succession of thoughts, it is no wonder that our notions of comparative duration shall have been, of late days, strangely altered.

And yet the state of this country, at the coming of Lord Anglesey, cannot altogether have passed from your remembrance. The time I speak of was that in which Mr. O'Connell and the representative of royalty—or rather the chief secretary, Mr. Stanley—contended for the mastery;—when each evening's Gazette contained a prohibitory proclamation, and the next day's Morning Register endorsed it with the Liberator's condescending *volo*—the time when public meetings were forbidden, and Mr. O'Connell advised his Repealers to make the requisite speeches, assembled at a Spartan dinner—when the Harpy proclamations fluttered over the merriment of the feast, and driven from the board, the liberators betook themselves to cups which cheer, but not inebriate, and thought the cause of freedom best promoted by arrangements in which, without much self-denial, they might husband all their intemperance for the speeches:—the time when, (for "where's that palace whereinto vile things sometimes intrude not")—even to the retirement of the breakfasts, the ugly proclamations followed, and regularly as the government prohibition pointed to the door, and gave the signal to disperse, the great agitator, like the figure at St. Dunstan's clock, stepped forward to give the sign a sound, and make it known to the world that the stout Repealers vanished, not because a foreign government commanded their retreat, but because the grand master himself, he who best "knew the true moment when exception bade him strike," counselled and commanded what for a time it was wise to do, and sounded the note for retiring. These are times of which you cannot altogether have lost the remembrance.

In those days, my Lord, there was the usual rivalry between

the provinces and the metropolis, and with no abatement of the wonted vivacity. Terry Alt was not less busy in the west and south than the Volunteer Association in the capital. In ancient Rome there was a contest between the most eminent of her orators and of her actors—whether Cicero could depict a sentiment in more varied language, or Roscius in a greater variety of gesture. A similar competition has long prevailed in our unhappy country, and has not yet been decided. Societies and unions in the metropolis have taken the orator's part, and Captain Rock and his successors in the country have gone through the terrible process of the gesticulation. Coincidently—I speak in sad seriousness—not by correspondence—the atrocities of predial disorder have illustrated the reckless eloquence of political agitation; and frequently the strong emotion awakened by some turbulent invective against the law or the law-church, has not been suffered to subside, before the nefarious harangue has had its answer in the report of one of those cannibal orgies in which the predial disturber, as he is styled—Captain Rock—"the boy that makes the fun stir," —volunteers the murderous duties of his office, appeals to the mangled witnesses of his cruelty, whether his part has been well done, and divides, with the orators of the movement, the suffrages of all just men's abhorrence.

The contest between town and country was at it height when the noble Marquess, having witnessed the performances here, set out, that he might honor, with impartial regard, the rival exhibitions in Clare and Galway. He was received with a demonstration worthy of the genius and the ambition of the actors who contrived it. About the time when the representative of royalty was entering Clare, the police, I mean the police of the *de jure* government, had made prisoners of some individuals who were engaged in the ceremony of administering oaths of fealty to the powers that be, to the *de facto* sovereign. Such an invasion of freedom was not to be endured—the prisoners were accordingly rescued, and the officious constables, to the number of five individuals, were stoned to death. This was the first incident of the drama got up for the Viceroy's entertainment. A spectacle followed, in which the five corpses, mangled and

marred beyond the conception of those who do not know how barbarism outrages the form of a murdered victim, were conveyed to the town of Ennis, where the Marquis was sojourning. Having had this proof of power and skill exhibited—having compelled the court of justice to suspend its sittings in consequence of the non-attendance of a jury—having asserted the prerogative of the place, and outdone the puny horrors of the metropolis—the predial disturbers exempted his Excellency from the duty of witnessing any other entertainment of a character equally tragic. With the instinctive politeness of Irishmen, the murderers washed the blood off their hands before they crowded to salute the beloved Lord Lieutenant; and obsequious journalists described his journey through a country into which he had had so inhuman a welcome—a welcome of which the gloomy remembrance must have abode with him, and made his heart sick—described this journey so begun— as a " triumphal progress." I might have said " so begun—so finished"—for if it commenced in horror, it ended in imbecility—the noble Marquess having entrusted to a committee of Roman Catholic priests and other influential individuals the office of restoring peace to the country, and having learned that they had dissolved their society in despair.(D) However, it may be said, that by a recourse to law, peace was restored to Galway and Clare, and the gentry who had been driven from their homes, leaving the disturbers in the occupancy of their houses and lands, were permitted again to resume possession. I am not giving you a history of these days, but recalling them to your remembrance for a purpose to which you shall presently see their application.

The times I speak of were those in which Mr. O'Connell usually appeared, on public occasions, decorated with colours of blended orange and green, both in his person and his discourses; and when Mr. O'Gorman Mahon (E) in the House of Commons, declared that " he had belonged, for eleven years and a half, to a select society of Catholics and Orangemen, which met to procure the repeal of the union;" the time when that bold-spirited gentleman added to his avowal, " This I tell you, Englishmen, you will have enough to do abroad without breaking your spears in the

bodies of us Irishmen, who have neither forgotten nor forgiven the days of ninety-eight;" and when Sir Robert Peel sternly rebuked Mr. O'Connell for his declaration that "Ireland was not yet ready to repel force by force."

At that time what was the language of the government press of England? Did they condemn Protestants for their ardour in the maintenance of British connexion? Did they accuse them of frenzy, and intolerance, and disloyalty? Did they strenuously urge upon them the duty of submitting the cause of their religion and laws to the mercy of the mob, or the discretion of a mob-led party? Would the suggestion, to give a preference to the loyal above the lawless, in the choice of tenants, then furnish occasion for a long month's angry declamation? Would the precaution to be provided against murderous assault, then be said to savor of insurrection? Oh, no—then the Protestants were warned against their and Great Britain's enemies—then it was proclaimed in the government press, (as, during the vicissitudes of a wavering battle, it might be encouragingly told, that the centre continued strong and firm,) then it was proclaimed, with expressions of triumph, that Ulster was all zealous for the union—then the *Courier* did not scruple to affirm that "the objects of the Irish agitators were of the blackest and most treasonable kind;" and the *Sun* condescended to enlighten the Orangemen and warn them against the blandishments of Mr. O'Connell; and the *Atlas* declared that "England had been fairly duped in her concessions; that the treachery of O'Connell and his party was manifest, and was admitted by the warmest advocates of Catholic emancipation." Then it was anticipated by this liberal journal, as a necessary consequence of the repeal agitation, that "Orange societies must increase," and that, "were it not for insurmountable religious scruples, they would increase by drafts from the higher orders of the Roman Catholics." Then the *Times* arranged its host on the side of Protestantism; and, instead of accusing us, had to stand to its own defence for raising the "No Popery" cry, and to place on record these memorable words:—"It has been said that we raise a 'No Popery' cry against O'Connell and the ambitious priests, his allies. Not so. But when a cry

bursts forth which has 'No Protestant' for its object, we answer it by an appeal to the hearts and arms!" (yes, my Lord, "and arms!") "of all who bear the name of Protestant. They have heard us—they are roused!—we know it, and we shall soon dismiss our apprehensions."

Will any man who regards his character, have the hardihood to affirm that the condition of the Protestants in Ireland is less perilous now than it was when those appeals to arms were made and answered. Then Mr. O'Connell courted the Protestants—now he denounces them. Then he wore a portrait of King William, the deliverer; he toasted the battle of the Boyne in cups filled with the Boyne water—he prayed forgetfulness and forgiveness for all past offences—he offered a similar amnesty on the part of himself and his friends, and he asked of us but one favor—to assist in breaking the bonds which united this country to Great Britain. Since then what changes have taken place? Government has sought, in season and out of season, to conciliate the agitator—has bestowed on him a patent of precedency—has shaped a reform bill to meet his wishes—has, in opposition to the best advice, given him a jury bill to his taste—has suppressed for him ten bishoprics—has permitted him to fit the coercion bill to his own purposes—has adopted his measures respecting tithes, and has permitted the enemies and the mortified friends of England to witness the manner of Earl Grey's fall.

Such are the measures by which, according to the dictates of those who call for vengeance on us, Ireland should be quieted. Conciliate those who represent the majority of the people, and crush all who interrupt or oppose the amiable endeavour. Well,—coercion may be very good for us; but what good has conciliation done in the instance of our adversaries? The letters to the Home Secretary,(F) to the people of Ireland, to William Sharman Crawford, render further answer unnecessary.

Concession, however, has not been wholly ineffectual.—I, my Lord, was one of those who looked upon the measure which granted power to the Roman Catholics, with serious apprehension. I saw in it, however, this good—that it would unmask the character of the church of Rome, such as it exists in Ireland—that it

would exhibit its character, not only to Englishmen and Protestants, but would show also, to the nominal members of the church of Rome itself, what is in reality the system they have been countenancing and upholding. One part of my anticipations has been realized. The oath taken as the condition of obtaining a seat in the legislature, by which church property was to be protected and preserved inviolate, is utterly disregarded; and, as if to render it wholly unequivocal that the profanation is regulated by principle, he among the Roman Catholic members who the most boldly breaks through all solemn engagements, is he who is most (perhaps I might say exclusively) distinguished, by a sanctimonious reverence for all the forms of his religion; who goes to the confessional from the platform or the board where he has exercised all the power of his invective for the overthrow of the church he had sworn not to disturb, and withdraws from the altar where he has been adoring and receiving the sacrament, in order to renew his vituperation. Let any man of single mind reflect upon the entire character of the anti-tithe warfare, carried on by men so sworn as Roman Catholic members of parliament, and let him say whether the most decided and plain-speaking bigots, ascendancy bigots, as they were called, ever hazarded a graver accusation against the church of Rome, than is now confirmed in the conduct of her members.

But they affect to explain and excuse their conduct. We swore they say, not to disturb the Protestant religion. Religion is not a thing of pounds, shillings, and pence. We will take away, if we can, the emoluments of the clergy, but we will never give any Protestant the least trouble about his religious belief. They do not tell the whole truth in saying that they swore not to disturb the Protestant religion; they swore also not to subvert or injure the establishment, and they violate that oath when they exercise the privileges, to obtain which they swore it, in the endeavour to deprive the clergy of their possessions. This, however, is a point so generally understood, that I shall not detain you with any comments upon it; but I cannot pass away from the defence without noticing its extreme and insulting profligacy. We meddle not with your religion; we assail only your church!—

we make no effort to free you from your delusion, but we will take care to disencumber your church of its possessions. We make no effort to deliver you from a false religion, in which if you die you must be lost; and for this merciful indulgence,—for allowing you to go to everlasting ruin, without an endeavour on our part to turn you towards heaven,—we think you ought not to judge us hardly for observing our oath of qualification in the manner which you call perjury, but our church calls the satisfaction by which the guilt of perjury must be atoned for.

Yes, Protestants of Ireland, this is the manner in which Mr. O'Connell justifies his conduct in making a convenience of his oath. He will not attempt to free you from a religion which he believes is carrying you to eternal death; and in return for this amiable concern for your repose and indifference to your welfare, he requires that you leave him undisturbed in his efforts to despoil your ministers, or your sons or brothers, and bring them to beggary. How ingeniously justice and character temper each other in this magnanimous procedure! You will admire it the more when you recollect that a Roman Catholic is under the sacred obligation to "persecute," or, as it has been mildly interpreted, to "convince" heretics of their errors, and "compel" (interpreted "persuade") them to enter the true church. What a glory then is his who can bring forward falsehood to his creed as a set off against perjury to the state, providing for himself a satisfaction at once for church and crown, alleging, as a compensation for the neglect of his controversial labors, that he has starved a parson; and replying to a complaint of violated engagements to the state, that he has with equal faithlessness mocked at the duties of his religion. This is, indeed, to be "great, glorious, and free," but it is a species of freedom and glory which we think not in the spirit of the British constitution, and we are not well pleased to see that the great adept in the mysteries out of which such liberty issues, is the "guide, philosopher and friend," of our reform ministers.

It does not abate our apprehensions to hear that there are one or two members of the Cabinet whom he has not over-mastered. We think it not a matter of very doubtful hazard to predict what

the fate of these refractory spirits is likely to be, when they have served the purposes for which, at present, they are tolerated. We look upon the accession of Mr. O'Connell to his Majesty's ministry in the capacity of honorary member, or volunteer associate, with feelings of alarm; and we see nothing in the character of parties on either side, which can prevent us from auguring ill to the stability of British connexion from so unprecedented a coalition.

But how is the coalition to be explained? How is it to be understood that a majority of the British ministers have preferred O'Connell to Earl Grey, and have chosen their discourteous associate, although to win him, they were constrained to deprive themselves of powers which they had pronounced necessary for the good government of Ireland? They could not hope to conciliate—they had too many proofs that favors and concessions were unavailing for any such purpose. They can scarcely have so forgotten their duties, and the sentiments of Englishmen as to desire the success of Mr. O'Connell's projects, and deliberately and wilfully to have increased his facilities for dismembering the empire. How comes it then that they are leagued with him, and, in the league, content themselves with subordinate occupations, content themselves with bringing forward such measures as they have induced him to favor with his approval? How comes it that ignominy like this can be courted.

Shall I hazard a conjectural solution? Suppose there be found among the ministry or their dependants (dependants on whom their own characters must depend) some who had been in close correspondence with Mr. O'Connell during those eventful years in which the cause of emancipation was rapidly approaching the crisis: suppose they had imprudently and almost traitorously given him council to agitate—not in the sense of Lord Anglesey's recommendation—but advice that he should agitate up to the very verge of rebellion, approaching it near enough to keep the Tory government embarrassed, but not overstepping the line, at which he might provoke Parliament into granting the powers necessary for putting treason down. Suppose Mr. O'Connell to retain possession of written documents conveying advice like this—can we

doubt that individuals, thus placed at the mercy of such a man, would submit to very humiliating conditions rather than undergo the consequences or the risk of exposure. He has given proofs that he holds no confidence sacred, longer than his convenience is warranty in its favor, and if, in their indiscretion, any of the present ministry or of their favored dependants, has made himself obnoxious to the power of such a man, the child may rue that is yet unborn, the concessions which shall be made in order to purchase his forbearance.

And are we really in circumstances when the idea of such interdependence between the agitator and the King's ministers shall present itself to the mind, and not be indignantly dismissed. Alas!—the late concessions—the late confidences—the late secessions, all impress upon us a sad conviction that such a suspicion makes no greater demand on our credulity than to believe that ambitious men, in their endeavours to possess themselves of power, would not be more scrupulous than they are proved to be by the sacrifices at which they consent to retain office. And what a man is he with whom the ministry have connected themselves? —a man who, at his first public appearance, put forward Repeal of the Union, as the great object to be attained—and who has never since changed his language, or, so far as may be conjectured, his purpose. Seeing such a man the adviser of his Majesty's ministers—seeing measures carried through the House of Commons calculated to effect a most disreputable spoliation, confessedly, an instalment paid to a demand, of which the extent is undiscoverable—can the Protestant laity and clergy in Ireland feel themselves in a happy or secure position? Can they think it wise to persevere in the maintenance of an outward composure, while their hearts are apprehensive—or suppose, that the inactivity which has been taken advantage of and the patience which has been abused to inflict the severities under which they are now suffering, can be a sufficient protection against the evils which may be not dimly prognosticated. And in such a state of things, could we expect that our efforts to preserve institutions dear to us, should have provoked such comment as an ex-minister of England lately visited upon them? Could we anticipate such cen-

sure as the noble earl's. What! Earl Grey!—the senator who quickened the rage and increased the power of our adversaries; who laboured successfully in prostrating or turning against us defences, wherein, as instruments, our trust had been placed—who did all that his abilities could effect, to bow the spirit of the friends of England, and to consolidate into a strong and impetuous mass the multitudes who would break her bonds asunder—when he has withdrawn himself from responsibility, and when he hears Protestant calling to persecuted and menaced Protestant to stand up and be provided against the evils which are, and which are coming—is he to add mockery to the wrongs he has already done, and to call their enthusiasm madness. Madness!—The Protestants of Ireland mad, because they think the storm is to be dreaded, when he who conjured it up has been swept from the helm—mad, for accepting instruction from the unexampled circumstances in which the prime minister of England was circumvented—are they mad for refusing to admit a thought that his associates are of a spirit knowingly to be partakers in intrigues which had so humiliating an issue;—or for believing, that unconscious instruments in a procedure so faithless and foul are convicted of a weakness and indiscretion which render confidence in them impossible? The Protestants of Ireland mad, because they think worse days are coming, when they see the pledged, sworn enemy of British connexion, dictating to the British government the measures they must adopt—marshalling them the way that they must go—excluding from the Sovereign's confidence—denying to the wishes of the people, every minister who will not follow in the track he points out, and toil at his behest in the dismemberment of the empire? And this is madness. It may be a small thing to Earl Grey that the connexion which binds Ireland to his country is snapped, and our unhappy land, with all its elements of fierce commotion, loosed upon a path of anarchy and blood. It may be to him a light thing that a generation perish, and in one member of the empire the Protestant race and name for a time be blotted out. But we will not lightly believe, that when he calls the efforts of Protestants to preserve the bonds of union, their firm determination to maintain the post in which they are set, under all disadvantages, by the name of madness—

we will not lightly believe, that, in this contemptuous and unfeeling sarcasm, he speaks the sentiments of the English people.—I am glad it was not in England he uttered this taunt. I am glad we have so decisive testimony of the character of the assembly to which he addressed it—an assembly in which he was not reminded of what was due to himself, by being forced to remember, from the presence in which he stood, what was due to the gallantry, and the worth, and the wisdom of the Scottish metropolis. I am glad to feel that the gentry of Scotland gave no countenance to the cruel scoff; and that the local circumstances in which Earl Grey thought it not unbecoming to insult the Protestants of Ireland, in their sore persecution and peril, gave ample assurance that he did not consult for the feelings, or speak the sentiments, of their brethren in any portion of the empire. Many beside Lord Grey have assumed an angry and a haughty tone in their commentaries on our proceedings. How changed from the language by which they persuaded English Protestants to give our enemies power! We should at least display their inconsistency; we should confront their past assurances with the contumelies wherewith they now assail us—appeal from their invectives to their solicitations—and make the distinction plain between the men who were deceived, and who now honourably acknowledge their error, and endeavour to repair the injuries they have occasioned; and the deceivers wherever they are, who think, by the vehemence of their present reckless and unworthy criminations, to efface the remembrance of the promises they have contemptuously broken.—I have the honor, therefore to move,

"That extracts be made, with a view to their publication, from the promises and pledges given by Roman Catholics and their advocates before the parliamentary committees, in 1825, and during the discussions which ended in the relief bill in 1829, declaring the attachment of one party to the established church, and the determination of the other not to exercise the privileges they solicited, to overthrow or disturb it—and from statements subsequently made by the same individuals—for the purpose of showing how far their promises and engagements have been violated or observed."

At a Meeting of the South Lancashire Society, held in the Amphitheatre, Liverpool, on November 21, 1834, to receive the Deputation from Ireland.

The Lord Kenyon in the Chair.

My Lord Kenyon—Gentlemen—I could have wished that my Rev. Friend had completed the case, which it was his purpose to lay before you, and enumerated the various complaints which the Protestants of Ireland have to prefer against their oppressors. I am acquainted with his discriminating industry. I know how extensively he has collected, and how carefully he has arranged, the testimonies by which his statements were to be confirmed. I know how scrupulously he has sought out, and how rigidly he has rejected, whatever could not endure the test of a severe scrutiny—and I have accordingly the strongest confidence in my mind, that had he continued his address until it had embraced all the topics which it was his purpose to submit to your consideration, the case of Protestantism in Ireland would have been fully made out, and you would not have complained of the length of time which such a case had imperatively demanded, and which would have been set before you, in an address, maintaining, from the commencement to the close, high claims on your attention. But however I regret that a statement so full of interest has not been completed, I do not for an instant hesitate to obey the call made upon me, and to state some of the reasons why we appear before you.

It has long been a fixed persuasion in my country, that the measures of late adopted or attempted by the Legislature, against the Protestants of Ireland, were not in accordance with our Sovereign's will—did not bear the impress of the British character. This per-

suasion has prevented the love of many for the name of England from waxing cold. It gives us confidence, too, that in the coming struggle, when the cause of truth and order and liberty, shall be put in peril—and we may be the first in whose persons it shall be assaulted—you will not abandon the right; and when, in prospect of such a crisis, we collect our energies to meet the coming danger, and when senators—planetary senators (A)—who were profuse in their expressions of attachment to the Church, while they were undermining its defences—(who were ready to promise, that when the walls of exclusion had fallen, we should, if danger threatened, find a nobler protection in walls of faithful men, and that they would be their leaders)—became equally lavish, when the dangers they invited had drawn near, in invectives against the church, and its betrayed, but resolute defenders, we had a proud and sustaining conviction that you did not participate in their feelings, or praise the cruel taunts, which, under so forbidding circumstances, they thought it not unworthy of them to utter. Therefore we are here; in the name of a body whose true faith and whose unprovoked wrongs give them a claim on your justice and good-will, to lay before you a plain view of the condition of the Irish Protestants, and solicit your attention to it.

There is a peculiarity in our case to which it is fitting that I should respectfully direct your attention. The statement which we have been deputed to submit to you has been, in all its material points, corroborated by the testimony of our adversaries' silence. When the ministry, of which Earl Grey was, or seemed the head, had given proof that they were acquainted with the dangers to which peaceable men in Ireland were exposed, and at the same time were, from whatever cause, incapable of affording them protection, the Protestants assembled to deliberate and to determine what, in so alarming an exigency, it became them to do. They felt that the evidences of danger and difficulty must be very glaring when they could extort such an acknowledgment as the coercion bill, that the measures of the reform ministry had not worked well; and they saw how hopeless was the thought of real protection from statesmen who could consent to forego clauses confessedly essential to a measure, which the disorders of Ireland imperatively

demanded. They saw, too, that in the endeavour to gain over Mr. O'Connell as an ally, and to propitiate him, by leaving agitation free, the cabinet had consented to renounce Earl Grey—that they were weakened by the loss of whatever influence his name imparted to them, and tarnished in reputation by the clandestine, or, if the word may be allowed, un-English practices, to which the noble Earl had fallen a victim. They felt that they were more interested in the character of the British ministry even than you. It would, no doubt, be to you a subject of poignant regret that the character of England should suffer from the conduct of those who presided over her councils; but such a feeling could not be painful and general without prompting the universal people to address earnest and respectful remonstrances to a Sovereign, the father of his subjects, who has never been inattentive to their petitions, never unobservant of their interests, and who would have, as I thank God he has, proved his love for the fame of England, by casting out the unworthy occupants of power, from whom the national honor had received a transitory tarnish. The case of the Protestants of Ireland was different. There, no time might be allowed for repairing evil. Every act which deprived the British ministry of influence—I mean honest influence —increased our danger. As the character of men in power becomes vile, so, also, their associates are more ignoble. As they forfeit the esteem of the wise and good, they must become, if they desire to retain place, less scrupulous in the selection of auxiliaries; and the concessions by which they purchase unhappy alliances, must progressively, as the traffic continues, become more dangerous and discreditable. And thus, strange as it may appear, although we, the Protestants of Ireland, could not regard Earl Grey as our friend, or the friend of simple justice—although his ministry had been to us a source of scarcely remediable evil—yet were our circumstances such, that we felt endangered by his fall; and although he had strengthened the hands of our enemies, and curtailed our means of resistance, we apprehended that the stratagem which excluded him from power diminished our hope of being protected. There was a species of injury which we felt the noble earl would not sanction. While he sate in a place of power,

rude and lawless violence must not dare to exhibit its most revolting attributes, and expand murder into massacre. But when the same post announced to us that Irish agitation had been pronounced free, and that Earl Grey had been driven from the government, we saw reason to apprehend that our struggle for existence was near at hand, and that Ireland must soon be separated from Great Britain, or become an arena of blood, unless our gracious Sovereign and the British people assumed the merciful and majestic part of righteous arbitrators, and forbade the sanguinary conflict. With such bodings at our hearts, and with a persuasion that the power and leading, which had been dangerous when confided to Earl Grey, were now abandoned to an irresponsible individual—the implacable enemy of British connexion, and, consistently, the organ of hostility to the established church—the Protestants of Ireland assembled. What was the matter and the result of their discussions, I need not repeat; they are not altogether unknown to you. The statement of my Rev. brother must have brought them to your remembrance, and I comment no farther upon them than to say, that our complaints were sufficiently forcible to extort from adversaries, taunts and foul language, but that it has not been found convenient to meet them by an exposition of their weakness, or an attempt to demonstrate their untruth.

Our complaint, generally stated, is, that there is in Ireland a conspiracy, extensively organized, having for its object to extirpate Protestantism, and effect a separation of Ireland from Great Britain; and employing as its instruments perjury and murder; employing these foul agents with a caution and skill which ensure their producing pernicious effects,—rapid emigration of Protestants, general insecurity, general alarm, estrangement of the great mass of the people from all respect for the laws, ascendancy of a reign of terror, under which human instincts, thoughts of mercy, natural or acquired regard for justice, become paralyzed, and the midnight legislator issues his dread mandate with a certainty of being obeyed, and with a discretion which retains Ireland under his sway, while not provoking, by too loud a cry of blood, and too extended a scale of atrocities, the indignation and vengeance of England.

We complain that a conspiracy like this should be suffered to waste and pervert a people; and we complain, that, after legislation has practised upon it for more than sixty years, it should still be pronounced " a mysterious system;" that it should be so styled, not by the rash or the timid, or those who have been termed the friends of religious exclusion, but, as you heard it stated, by the Chief Justice of Ireland, one whose eminent intellectual qualities have been universally acknowledged, and whose political predilections have been of that kind which are termed liberal, and which were supposed to be in unison with, or at least not opposed to the principles of the late administration. On such testimony you are assured that the system of outrage which has afflicted Ireland for sixty years remains to this day a mystery.(B) Why is it a mystery? Because the British constitution was an inadequate instrument to contend with it. It is a mistake which one moment's attention must remove, to suppose that a constitution like that of England must of necessity be applicable to all states of society. Why is it that the people of this country have prospered under its influence? Because their habits, their morals, their religious feelings, and, if it may be said, their prejudices, their noble prejudices, were in accordance with it. Laws may be mild, where they meet, through the universal people, reverence and love. Where every citizen will be a voluntary minister of justice, where it is accounted honorable as well as righteous to aid the law, and to prevent and punish crime, mild and merciful restraints will be sufficient to curb the evil doer, and to secure protection to the well-affected. But where there is no predisposition favorable to British law,—where it has to overcome antipathy, and to withstand combination, where, to perpetrate foul murder is accounted an act of brave revenge, or a visitation of justice—where, in obedience, perhaps, to some uncontrolable sense of duty, to aid in detecting murder, is a crime for which no atonement can be accepted, which is assuredly visited in the destruction of the unhappy offender, in the massacre of his unoffending relatives—where the name not to be endured, the name that stamps indelible dishonor on whole generations, is the name of informer—who can be bold enough to say, that the

British constitution, in its mildness, can create aids which should be found provided for it in predisposing habit and circumstances, and can overcome those ungenial influences by which its peaceful rule is obstructed.

Allow me to ask wherein is your reliance that justice shall be here among yourselves, duly administered? Is it not placed upon a confident persuasion that all men will lend it assistance? What is your trust that witnesses shall deliver true testimony, and juries give honest verdicts? Is it not a dependance on the combined influences of the love of justice, and of reverence for the sanctity of an oath? What trust of this nature can be justified in Ireland? Is there love of justice there? Assuredly not of English justice. What your laws and consciences pronounce a crime, is in Ireland accounted duty. What you conceive to be a felon's death, is in Ireland a martyrdom. What all men here feel to be their bounden duty, would be in Ireland accounted an insufferable dishonor. How then can love of justice make a way for the British constitution? And an oath—there is one oath which has been well kept—the oath which causes the system of outrage to remain a mystery; but as to the sanctity of oaths, which should aid in effecting the ends of justice; among the great mass of the Irish people, it is altogether unfelt and unregarded. Even in the practices by which they have been taught to feel abhorrence for the book on which they are sworn, provision has been made that their respect for oaths shall be diminished. I need not, I am assured, remind you of the many instances in which sacrilegious outrages have been perpetrated on the book of God's word in Ireland, and of the station and character of individuals by whom these outrages have been committed or applauded. In your abhorrence of such offences you should not suffer the thought to escape you, that, beside their direct effect in bringing Scripture into disesteem, they have also the collateral advantage of rendering perjury less revolting—of, in fact, familiarising the minds of multitudes of men to the thought that an oath taken on a book which ought to be destroyed, can never be looked upon in the light of a solemn or a binding engagement. (C)

Is the British constitution fitted for such a state of things? Is it wonderful that it has not had power to penetrate the conspiracy which opposed it? In truth, as has been frequently admitted, it has been almost universally our condition in Ireland, that while having the British constitution in name, we have, in fact, been thankful for repeated suspensions of it, and that we must often be contented to submit to the restraints of an Insurrection Act, or be exposed to the horrors of an insurrection. But, it should be observed, that it was not alone because of the defective instrumentality of the constitution, the confederacy for crime in Ireland remained so long a mystery, but also because it may have suited the purposes of some in high places, to co-operate with the agents in the nefarious system, in covering it with secrecy. It is said that concealment of our disorders and excesses has been studied; and that even the patronage and power conceded to men in authority to aid them in upholding law, have been, in Ireland, profaned to the culpable end of keeping concealed from the public eye the flagrant excesses which had not been repressed or punished. I hold in my hand the testimony of a writer—not a Protestant, nor the friend of Protestantism—not a Tory, or the approver of Tory rule, but a Roman Catholic, I believe a Jesuit, whose object seemed to be exclusively to advance the interests of his religion, and to co-operate with her friends; but who, in a moment of indiscretion, disclosed a fatal truth to the disadvantage of his Whig supporters. Thus Mr. Plowden wrote of the Bedford Administration, which oppressed Ireland during part of the years 1806 and 1807:—

"They betrayed an uncommon anxiety to suppress the magnitude of the evil (the prevalence of insurrection in Ireland) from the eyes of the public; and for that purpose resorted to the hacknied expedient of bribing the periodical publications into silence or misrepresentation. To some of the more independent papers in circulation, they offered the publication of the government-proclamations and advertisements, on condition of their admitting no article in their paper which should set forth fairly the actual situation of the Threshers (D) in the western counties. Government was doubly anxious that the English public should

believe that there was neither complaint nor cause of discontent remaining in Ireland. It was their pride to be thought capable of keeping the country in complete tranquillity without resorting to martial law or the suspension of the *habeas corpus*, which their predecessors had always insisted upon as imperiously necessary for that purpose. The proposal of government was rejected; and some true and very alarming reports of the Threshers were brought before the public."

Such was the service solicited from the press in Ireland, not quite successfully at that day, and which at the present no government could procure. We have now a Protestant press, careful of its character for independence and truth, and indefatigable in its well-directed endeavors to expose, and draw public attention to, the grievances of the country. To a great extent, the mystery of the conspiracy has been explored; and in the same proportion as its purposes and instruments are exposed to public execration, have those who seek the downfall of our church become more audacious in the avowal of their intentions.

The designs they once were ashamed to disclose, they now justify. They pretend to imagine that the revenues with which a Protestant church is endowed have been wrested from their rightful proprietors—the clergy of the church of Rome; and that their present possessors should not be longer permitted to retain them. My Rev. friend has shown you the fallacy of this imagination, and I shall add but a brief remark to his convincing arguments. You had in England, as we in Ireland, a pure, independent national church, until the time of the Norman invasion. From that day the Papacy was making gradual encroachments—insinuating itself, as it were, into the occupation of English revenues—until, in process of time, it was found to be an intolerable evil that ecclesiastics named and preferred by the Bishop of Rome, were expending, on the continent, revenues provided by the piety of private individuals, or the bounty of sovereigns, in England, at a time when the church was independent of foreign control. This was made the subject of strong remonstrance in the parliament of Edward I.; it was made,

also, the subject of legislative enactment; and from the reign of that monarch to the accession of Henry VIII., we find a constant struggle between England and Rome—the one for independence, the other to maintain her usurpations. The difference in the state of things between the reign of Henry and his predecessors was simply this: the laws which they enacted he was able to enforce; and, while he remained in heart attached to the superstitious dogmas of the church of Rome—while he retained, and (so far as persecution of those whom we may call Protestants could justify it) deserved his title, "Defender of the Faith"—he vindicated the majesty of the crown, and upheld the principle that all who were possessors of endowments in England must be amenable to British law.

This was not, be it observed, to make any *ex post facto* law, which by retrospective operation should unjustly deprive men of their rights, it was simply to provide that all who did not obey a law previously made, should submit to its penalties. Some individuals loved Rome better than England; some loved—indeed we might say, almost all, loved—England's honor and independence better than Rome;—but the matter most important to be observed is this, that all financial affairs, at least all in which the principle of transfer was concerned, were completed before any reformation in doctrine was attempted; so providential was the care of our pure church, so benevolently was it arranged, that the proceedings of law with respect to endowments should be distinct from and should precede alterations affecting the faith of the people, and restoring its scriptural character to our national establishment. (E) So much for the asseveration that the church of Rome was unrighteously despoiled.

The cry, however, from which most danger has been apprehended to our Irish branch of the establishment is, that it is the church of a small minority of the people, and that having failed to effect the purposes for which it was endowed, it should now be divested of unprofitable emoluments. Surely, to use the gentlest language, this is most inconsistent. The epoch of what was termed Catholic emancipation is not so distant that we can have forgotten the argument which had most effect in winning

favor to its advocates. It was, that the church of England could never be fairly exhibited to individuals not members of her communion, so long as political exclusion created a kind of repulsive influence around her. Give opportunity, it was said, for jealousy to subside. Let the comparative merits of rival systems be so proposed to unprejudiced minds, that the judgment—the unbiased judgment of men—may without passion decide upon them, and more will have been done to advance the cause of true religion than sordid interests or persecution for conscience sake ever did for the promotion of hypocrisy. This was the argument which procured if not the most numerous the most creditable train of supporters. It was the argument to which the final adjustment of the measure was chiefly owing. The Church of England was thought to be incapacitated by its safeguards from exercising its powers of usefulness. It was supposed to be in the condition of James I. in his armour, when the incumbered and guarded monarch said of himself, "Now nobody can hurt me, and I can hurt nobody." This was the prevailing sentiment respecting the disabilities by which the church was protected; and it was confidently asked by statesmen of high reputation, whether it would not be wise to repeal those statutes by which the church was not secured, but oppressed.

Permit me to remind you of some declarations of this character. Thus spoke Earl Grey:—"With respect to the church of Ireland, the case does not stand exactly in the same point of view. The great obstacle to that establishment has been, that it is the church of a minority of the people; and that it is the church of so small a minority has been owing, in a great degree, to those very laws that we are struggling against. Take away the false protection of exclusionary laws, and the ministers of that church whose doctrines are superior in truth and excellence will prevail in the conflict." Sir H. Parnell said—"He would take upon himself to say, that he would place every confidence in the Roman Catholic clergy as to their future conduct, especially as relative to the due observance of the laws and the preservation of tranquillity. It had been stated that the measure would take away one of the main supports of their power,

and diminish their influence over the minds of the popul...
but he would say further, in consequence of the communic...
he had with many of the Roman Catholic clergy, that they...
find great difficulties in maintaining their religion to the...
to which they had been enabled to keep it up. The Ca...
would find themselves in a different situation when they h...
to deal with a people excited by just causes of complaint."
many extracts to the same effect, but I will trespass on y...
tention with but one more. I select it, because it is the ...
instance of a promise made on behalf of the Roman Cathol...
their friends, at the era of emancipation, which has be...
Upon that occasion Lord Palmerston was found among t...
phets, and he uttered the following prediction:—"It sh...
remembered, however, that although a small party mi...
throwing its weight into nearly poised balances, give the ...
derance to one, yet that the measures which it was suppo...
Catholics would be desirous to carry were of such a natu...
they could succeed only when they could support them ...
cided majority; and that being the case, it was impossi...
thirty or forty Roman Catholics could effect their adoptio...
it was said that in the case of a tottering, weak minis...
Roman Catholics might, by their co-operation and assista...
tain a mastery. Such a supposition was absurd. T...
moment a ministry so misconducted itself it would be...
by every Protestant, and crushed by its own baseness or i...

I spare you further extracts. Five years have elapsed ...
disabilities of Roman Catholics were removed—five years ...
ardent political commotion—of wilder political daring, ...
peaceful times, have been registered in our annals: and ...
in this brief season of strife and conflict, the Roman Cat...
Ireland have not been brought within the pale of the ch...
cry is, down with her—down with her, even to the gro...
1829, the church was commiserated, because within her ...
of political exclusion, her excellence remained unknown ...
whom her jealous defences angered, and she never had l...
trial of what her amiable and edifying doctrines coul...
plish. In 1834 the condolence is forgotten—a new spi...

to dictate the prophecies in which the oracle of statesmanship O'Connellizes; and it is gravely affirmed, as if the five years of failure had confirmed the accusation of unprofited centuries, that the church has been proved incompetent to its duties, and ought to be dis-established. (F) But has the church by her own supineness or misconduct merited this condemnation? Has she been negligent of her duty, and has she proved, by indifference to the interests of true religion, that the coming centuries must be, so far as her liberties are concerned, not more productive of good than the past have been? No: the very men who clamorously demand the overthrow of the church, because it is not, as they say, the church of the people, expose themselves by the inconsistent violence with which they denounce her exertions to bring the people within her pale. The church establishment is exposed to a two-fold hostility. The animosity with which it is regarded as a bond of connexion between this country and Ireland is now thoroughly understood, and there is no scruple on the part of its adversaries to avow that it must be overthrown in order that that *esprit de corps*, which now creates a Protestant resistance to the project of a repeal of the legislative union, may become extinct. I spare you further remarks on this ground of offence, and beg your attention to the fact, that the war upon the temporalities of the church is the response provoked by endeavours to extend her spiritual blessings to numbers for whose souls her ministers regarded themselves responsible. The policy was worthy of Rome. Her errors are exposed, her domination invaded, and she calls up an excitement which causes the interest of controversy to grow faint, because she finds it easier to wreak full vengeance upon the persons of her opponents, than, in the resources of sophistry, to procure an answer to their arguments.

Proof upon this point is abundant, but, although it is of too much importance to be lightly passed over, it is not of consequence enough to justify a very detailed exposition. I shall confine myself to a single proof—the testimony of the late Right Rev. Doctor Doyle. He says, speaking of the Protestant clergy—"As to their acts of benevolence, there are several of them who are extremely kind, and their wives and children, are,

I believe, not less well disposed. But their means are small." When it answers the purpose of our enemies, the church is represented as overladen with wealth, and its ministers in a state of more than affluence. "Latterly, unfortunately for themselves, and for the peace of the country, they have almost universally been influenced by over zeal in religion; and whilst with one hand they may scatter a few benefits, with the other they sow discord, and the clergyman and his family are, amongst us, what we call prosletysers, who disturb the peace and the people, and do a vast deal of mischief while they do some good." He was asked—"Is it not a fact, that a great proportion of the clergy of Ireland do not leave competent incomes for their families, and that very nearly the entire of their income is spent in the country?" He replied—"It is." He was also asked, at what time the controversial labours of the church of England commenced? and he answered, in 1824.

Here you should be aware, the Rev. Prelate endeavours to justify the breach of his engagement to the church establishment, by alleging a disapproval of her efforts to make proselytes among the members of his communion. These efforts he affirms were unprovoked by the ministers of his church, and were, therefore, regarded with feelings of keener asperity. It is only to correct a misstatement I would observe that the fact was not so. Far more creditable had it been to the ministers of our church in Ireland, had we, at all times, endeavoured to win souls from an unscriptural system—more creditable had the impulse which of late years roused us to exertion not been provoked by the bold assaults of adversaries. This, however, is the truth—Dr. Doyle not incorrectly dates the commencement of our exertions from the year 1824. At that time, for at least two years, the artifice and energy of the church of Rome had been employed against us. In the year 1822 controversial sermons were preached in the city of Dublin, of such a character, that the *Dublin Evening Post*, a journal at that time the organ of the Roman Catholics, was constrained to describe those of one Romish ecclesiastic as "pestilent and abominable incentives to blood;" to call upon the authorities of the church of Rome to prohibit them, and to confess that they

had aroused the fiend of theological rancour. In this year too, and while such sermons were sounding in men's ears, or under perusal in their hands, (for they were printed, and extensively circulated,) was made public the astounding truth, that there was a conspiracy extensively organized, having for its object the extirpation of Protestants, and the effecting a separation from heretic England. The year following, 1823, was the era of the Hohenlohe miracles, at which you might smile in the security of your happy land, or on which you might calmly moralize with compassion for human beings in a state in which such things could seriously interest them; but we looked on with an earnestness not wholly free from alarm, and when we remembered the ecclesiastical incentives to blood, the abominable conspiracy brought imperfectly to light, the pernicious interpretations of prophecy which unceasingly stimulated hope and enterprise, and heard of miracles, in which the prelate who authenticated them declared, " that in this time and in this place"—time and place memorable chiefly because of the pestilent instruction which disgraced the pulpits of the church of Rome, and the detestable conspiracy of which her members were convicted—"in this time and place it was worthy of God's Providence that the light of his countenance should be shed upon his faithful people,"—the Protestants in Ireland looked upon the deepening mysteries with wonder and apprehension, and were compelled to see the church of Rome in a light in which it never before had been revealed to them. It was under such circumstances the clergy of the church of England addressed themselves to the important controversy, of which the great effects will, at no distant day, be made known; and while I disclaim for them the credit which their exertions would obtain from all who feel a deep interest in religion, had they originated in a sense of duty not thus perilously awakened, —I must also, on their part, deprecate the imputation, that they wantonly rushed into controversy, and provoked the opposition which they only met, and over which, I trust in God, they shall yet be found successful. (G)

One thing is clear, that the ministers of the church of England have of late years laboured to retrieve the character of their office;

and that, whatever success their efforts may have had in making truth known and exposing false doctrine, they have awakened the alarm of the church of Rome. Is it not reasonable to enquire whether this alarm denotes a success which it would be well to foster? If the efforts to disabuse the votaries of Rome were altogether hopeless—if they had not been productive of some good, would so fierce a hostility be called out against the church which has made them? I believe, and not on light grounds, that they have proved eminently successful—I believe that they have brought conviction home to the reason of multitudes who yet remain nominal members of the church, from which at heart they are dissentient. (H)

But has our government—have those who, on its five years' trial, condemn the church because its proselytes are not numerous—have they carefully explored the effect of its exertions, and co-operated with it in winning Roman Catholics from their errors? Have they given it even the five years' trial, and taken care that with its influence undiminished, and its character unimpared, it has been enabled to avail itself of all opportunities to advance the cause of truth, and make its light to shine before men that they should glorify their Father who is in heaven; or have they condemned it to unworthy degradation; have they withdrawn facilities of usefulness; have they, by affronts and injuries, taught enemies to anticipate its speedy overthrow, and indisposed all but fast friends from giving heed to its claims on their reverence and affection? Within the brief space of five short years, was it in the nature of things to anticipate that such a series of wrongs should be visited on a scriptural and a national establishment? Will you endure a brief history of them? You remember that the education of the country was wrested from Protestant associations, and given up—it is not too much to say—to the Roman Catholic priesthood. The basis of education had been religious; it was indispensable that the word of God should be read in the schools. The system was termed Scriptural. The basis is now not religious. The Scriptures may not, dare not be read during the hours of school instruction. Even the selections made from Scripture, but not denominated as if they were so ex-

tracted—the "Christian Lessons" are not, of necessity, to be read—they are "earnestly recommended," but not imperatively enjoined upon teachers or pupils. It is a new thing in Protestant England that the name "Scriptural" shall be taken down from the tablets whereon the character of her education was described, and that "National" shall be set up in its place. It was reserved for days like ours to see national—the National of England placed as the opposite, and the substitute for "Scriptural." (I)

The Christian Lessons are "earnestly recommended!" "Earnestly recommended!" The expression is tantamount to a prohibition. It intimates to schoolmasters who are true to the church of Rome, that the reading of the church lessons was earnestly recommended by Protestant commissioners, and effectually resisted by commissioners of the church of Rome. They will, perhaps, understand it as conveying an intimation that there had been opposition in the board-room—Protestants requiring that the lessons be read, Roman Catholics insisting that the reading of them should be indifferent; until perhaps at last, one learned in the law, may have assumed the office of an arbitrator, and soothed the consciences of the one party, and served the purposes of the other, by softening the injunction of the one side, and the indifference of the other into the neutralizing, "earnest recommendation." If this was the advice of any legal functionary, it has not altogether the merit of originality. Official investigations may have suggested it. There are counties in Ireland in which friends of the Sheriff are sometimes placed in the gentlemanly circumstances of exposure to demands, which, however questionable the shape in which they come, it is not found convenient to answer. The Sheriffs, to avert unpleasant meetings with gentlemen so circumstanced—if they mean to attend any public assemblage—suppose a race-course—give notice of their intention; and signify their willingness to execute any trust confided to them at the time and place specified. This notice is in the form of an invitation; but those whom it most concerns understand, and are careful not to intrude themselves within the tabooed premises. This, perhaps, is the precedent which those who advised the commissioners of education had adroitly adopted; and when the ingenious schoolmaster re-

ceives the Christian lessons with the accompanying recommendation of the board, he will translate the expression into the vernacular Romaic, and learn that he is especially warned against them.

The next injury inflicted on our church was of a twofold nature. It was affirmed that the expenses of divine worship must no longer be defrayed from the land on which it was laid as an extremely light encumbrance; and, in order to provide a fund as a substitute, ten bishoprics were suppressed—their revenues confiscated to this unlooked-for use, and a tax, varying in extent from five to fifteen *per centum* of income, imposed on all ecclesiastics, who from the date of the passing of this extraordinary act, should obtain preferment. Was this upholding the character of our church establishment, so that men might, without prejudice, examine its claims upon their affection? Was it a time to encourage expectations of the rapid though gradual destruction of the church in the minds of those over whose heated imagination prophesies of such a fall, thus corroborated, would have greater power than reason could exercise over their understandings to recommend the excellence of scriptural doctrine? But I will not dwell on a topic like this—the bill has become the law of the land. Surely it was severe to visit such an indignity on an institution undergoing the trial to which our church has been made subject.

Another outrage was planned—it is not wonderful that its contrivers should calumniate the assembly to whose sense of integrity it is owing that the evil was not perpetrated. I allude to the bill which passed the Commons during the last session, and which was so honorably rejected in the House of Lords. This bill has been so dishonestly misrepresented, and has been so very generally misunderstood, that I hope to be pardoned for offering you a brief account of the principle on which it was constructed.

Its intention was to substitute for the tithe, over all Ireland, a land-tax equal to four-fifths of its amount, recoverable from the principal landlord, who might again recover from his tenants. It was not intended, however—at least, it was not declared—that the tithe-owner should lose the entire 40 per cent. which was

to be given as a bonus to the landlord. It, perhaps, was thought that, taking into account the tax to which ecclesiastical income was already subjected—a tax imposed on the clergy, in order that another bonus should be bestowed on the landowner—so large a deduction would be too cruel a spoliation. It was accordingly provided, that, in addition to the sixty per cent. left after the grace to the landed interest, the state should advance twenty to the tithe owner, so that, allowing for the costs of collection, which the government were pleased to charge, the clergy should receive for every hundred pounds of their rights a sum of not less than 77*l.* 10*s.* We do not live in times when liberality to the ministers or the ministration of religion is a political vice, and we are not, therefore, to be surprised that parliament was resolved to reclaim the amount of loan with which the ministers of religion were to be favoured. The twenty per cent. advanced by government to make up a moiety of the deduction from tithe income was to be repaid. And from what source? I am not ashamed to confess my wonder at the thought that Englishmen could meditate, and could, without shame or rebuke, declare, the sacrilegious plunder by which the means were to be procured. An act to which I have already referred had passed in a preceding session of parliament, for the suppression of ten bishoprics, the sale of bishops' lands, and the taxation of clerical income. It is called the church temporalities act, and it makes provision out of the funds thus procured for certain purposes which it recites.

1. To provide things necessary for the celebration of divine service.
2. Salaries for parish clerks and sextons.
3. Fencing and maintaining churchyards.
4. Building, enlarging, or repairing churches.
5. For maintenance of curates in lieu of vestry assessments, wherever such had been levied for that purpose.
6. For building glebe-houses—to be repaid at four per cent.
7. For the augmentation of benefices under 200*l.* per annum.
8. To make good deficiencies, happening by the union of bishoprics—
9. and when the income of a bishopric had been reduced below 4,000*l.* per annum.

Of these items, the three first had been provided for by what was termed the church cess; as also the ordinary repairs of churches. The expenses attendant on the building of churches were defrayed by loans made either by parliament or by the Board of First Fruits—generally by the latter; and repaid by the respective parishes in instalments of four per cent. The expense of building glebe-houses was defrayed either by the clergy, or by a loan from the Board of First Fruits—repaid in instalments. In addition to these charges the other are to be defrayed, as its peculiar province, by the new church commission. Now, it was computed by the government, when giving up the church cess, that a grant was made to the payers amounting to sixty thousand pounds, and thus it could be shown that the church commissioners would be required to meet demands, amounting to not less than one hundred and thirty thousand pounds. But this is not left to calculation or conjecture. It was distinctly stated by Earl Grey, that the demands upon the new fund would be not less than one hundred and thirty-five thousand pounds. Upon the occasion when the noble Earl made this statement, he expressed his hope that when all the expected funds were realized, they would amount to one hundred and fifty thousand. The period, however, at which this consummation was to take place was very distant—the expected amount more than doubtful—and, in the meantime, the church commissioners were to commence operations by borrowing a sum amounting to one hundred thousand pounds, for which they were to pay four per cent. interest, and for which the entire of their funds, existent and expected, were to be the security. (K)

Now, judge you what was the character of a measure, which should make this visionary fund answerable for an additional hundred and forty thousand pounds per annum; for, to this large amount would the sum extend, which was required to effect the reduction to be made to the landlords in Ireland. According to the calculation made by Mr. Griffiths, the amount of tithe, lay and ecclesiastical, is seven hundred and twenty thousand pounds, of which the fifth, which was to be ultimately provided from what was called the perpetuity fund, would exceed one hundred and forty thousand—that is to say, would ex-

ceed very considerably any amount that ever could be realized, to make provision for the expenses of public worship. So profligate an exertion of power the history of our country does not record. It was not satisfied with effecting a single evil; it was not satisfied with mocking at the enactments of the preceding year—with taking for a secular purpose the funds raised from ecclesiastical income, and specially dedicated to ecclesiastical purposes; by a single effort it was contrived that all orders of Protestants, if this act were carried into effect, should be rendered participators in, or sufferers from, a most unrighteous spoliation. The humbler Protestant would be punished by the deprivation of those religious services which he had been taught to consider his right. To him there would be presented the aspect of dilapidated places of worship—the house associated with all his best and happiest feelings sinking to decay—the soil which covered the remains of those he loved left without its protection. It may be said that, in time, humbler edifices would arise—buildings requiring less cost to raise and to repair—but what would be the state of transition? I do not hesitate to affirm, so few are the exceptions, that every poor Protestant loves the precincts of his parish church. Yes, even those whose feelings are not keenly awake to the religious instruction imparted to them—I do not hesitate to affirm that the sacred dwelling in which the most solemn epochs of the poor man's life were hallowed by prayer—the church-yard, where he has deposited with solemn feelings and solemn words the remains of parent, brother, friend, have an interest in his affections not to be measured by the light-hearted or fully understood by the prosperous. Further, I do not hesitate to affirm that many a time when the forsaken Protestant has brooded sternly over the wrongs he has experienced from a legislature which did not know his worth, or from lawless men whom that legislature would caress because it dared not attempt to control them; and when the purpose has dawned upon his soul that he would abandon an unhappy land, and go where at least he would not have ingratitude to sting him;—yes, I do not hesitate to affirm, that, many a time, the village bell, or the village spire, or the remembrance of the spot where once he

hoped to rest with his fathers, has disturbed the stern purpose, and he has with a melancholy feeling resigned himself to influences, which no neglect of the government and no malice of his enemies can enable him to resist.—The late projected acts would have disembarrassed him, and given a new stimulus to Protestant emigration. It would have dishonoured the clergy in the eyes of the world, and made them feel deeply a sense of degradation. Would it have been suitable to their character and calling that they should accept and appropriate to their private uses the sums previously allocated to the making provision for the due celebration of divine service, and for upholding the permanency of a religious ministration. And if they had accepted it, and if the consequence were, that the houses of God were falling to decay, in order that their household hearths should not be comfortless—what voice could be lifted to defend their tarnished fame, or who could take upon him the base office of defending rights which had no other origin or security than that which sacrilege had given them?

Would the aristocracy of our land have escaped this curse if they had accepted the unholy bribe? No, nor as it was finally contrived, would they have even purchased tranquillity; they had no power to bribe the tenants from whom their tithe tax was to be recovered; the tenant was to have by the law, as it was framed, the same indulgence which was yielded to his landlord; and thus, while there was no reason to hope that the resistance to the payment of tithe or its substitute would in any degree be lessened—while there was not the slightest additional security obtained by the iniquitous sacrifice which was intended—while there was every reason to anticipate that the tenantry, who had conspired against tithe, would find in the measure their violence had extorted, encouragement to persevere, and to require that, next year, the landlords should unite in the combination to ruin a long persecuted clergy; there was ample provision made in the one sacrilegious act for the dishonor of the Irish gentry, the utter debasement of the ministers of their religion, and the alienation of the humbler Protestants of Ireland from their church and country. I do not impute to his Majesty's late ministers a deliberate contemplation of conse-

quences like these. I do believe they would have willingly permitted the church to stand, if it were consistent with their security in office that it should remain unharmed. Neither do I impute to any sordid feeling the tenacity with which, through continually augmenting evil repute, they adhered to place, until they were detruded from it. What mighty projects they may have had at heart, which reconciled them to the dishonor incurred in prosecuting their intent, from a hope that a glorious end might have sanctified it, I am unable to imagine. That there may have been such I will not venture to gainsay; but, judging of the bill they endeavoured to urge upon the church, from its character and its necessary consequences, I would not hesitate to affirm, even if proofs were less clear than they are, that the King's ministers were practised upon by a subtler spirit than their own, and that an enemy had done this wrong. Compare it with the reports of the tithe committee—with that expensive inquest from which important and beneficial consequences were expected, and would naturally have resulted. Compare it with the church temporalities bill of the preceding year, and say whether the malice of the most insidious enemies could desire to exhibit the ministers of the crown in an aspect of deeper humiliation than when they submitted to the necessity of bringing before parliament their late rejected abortion. What!—to institute an enquiry into the subject of tithes, causing heavy expense to the nation—to bring before parliament the instructive results, and to carry through both houses, and obtain the King's sanction to an act, founded on the reports of this committee;—in continuance—extending power to the extreme limits at which taxation tends, and spoliation commences—to carry through and make law the temporalities act—to soothe the scruples of many, and procure the silence of some by assurances that, at least, what was now left to the church had acquired a security which never could be violated; and, after all this, to be reduced to the mortifying necessity (the more distressing because it was not yielded to under physical, or even moral compulsion) of coming before parliament, and asking the house, in forgetfulness of all preceding contracts and engagements—in contradiction to all just reasoning or fair principle—

to pass an act which could have none other effect than the destruction of the established church in Ireland, and the rendering vile the memory of its ministers. That this would have been the effect of the bill it is impossible to doubt. All ecclesiastical persons are made liable to taxation, in order that from their incomes a fund may be raised which, in process of time, may become sufficient to defray the expenses of public worship, and provide for the permanency of a religious ministration. So soon as the principle of this taxation is admitted, and before one shilling of the expected fund has been realized, while it is burdened by a debt of 100,000*l.* to provide for indispensable charges, a new bill is introduced to parliament to confiscate and assign for ever to secular purposes this sacred deposit. Was I wrong in saying that an enemy had done this, or in affirming that a more flagrant instance of political profligacy does not dishonor the annals of our country ?

I am fully aware of my deficiencies in describing the details of an act like this. In truth, my acquaintance with financial matters of large amount has been so purely speculative and theoretical, that it has not qualified me for the task, and I undertook it, relying, not on my power to explain, but on your quickness of apprehension. Of this I am thoroughly convinced, that if one gentleman of the thousands whom I have the honor to address, were here, bringing to the execution of the task which I have inadequately undertaken, the accuracy and force which distinguish the statements of practical men, men conversant with affairs of business, he would set forth the reckless dishonesty of a measure which despised alike the rights of humble Protestants, the character of the educated, and the maintenance of true religion, with such a fidelity and power, that no man who valued good report among his fellows would ever hazard the utterance of a word to relieve the odium universally awakened against so unprincipled and treacherous a procedure.

If I might use such a freedom, I would recommend the bill to your calm and serious consideration—for, so general is the indisposition among the great majority of men to enquire deeply into such matters, that you may often meet with persons upright and

intelligent in the affairs of the world, who had not perceived the iniquity of this sacrilegious scheme, or understood how well entitled to a nation's gratitude was the illustrious assembly in which it was defeated; and how fully provoked was the withering invective which a noble representative of one part of this great county poured out upon its contrivers, in the eloquence of a virtuous indignation. But one thing, at least, has become evident to all; that from the time at which the late ministry submitted to be the undertakers of such a bill, they have been progressively becoming viler in public estimation—and, in their measures, more obviously the servants of a party not favorable to British interests. As their characters sunk, their desperation augmented. As they lost the esteem and support of the wise and good, they were reduced to the necessity of accepting and even of purchasing, at an extravagant rate, the suspicious services of a most unseemly and unnatural alliance—an alliance which carried them off from the ways of safe policy—from the countenance and support of honorable associations—until they were to be seen, like Gulliver in the arms of the Brobdignagian ape, on the house-top, now patted almost to death by his unsightly protector's afflicting fondness—now surfeited and choking with the filthy morsels from his foul mouth—tormented with pain, yet not daring to move member or muscle—not daring to perform any act of will, as he thinks of what he dare not look upon—the dizzy descent, over which, in the wantonness of an uncouth and terrible hilarity, the brute was dandling him. How deeply thankful should we be that this disgusting exhibition has been closed. What grateful thanksgivings should we offer to the Most High for the merciful interposition he has vouchsafed in our favor? Who is present here who will not join in acclamations to the name of the constitutional monarch who has rescued the weal and glory of Great Britain from such a custody? (L)

A great poet has said, speaking of a grand military spectacle—

> "'Twere worth ten years of peaceful life
> One glance at their array."

I can now fully understand the expression, and say, that had my

25981

life from infancy to the present day, been a continuance of toil and disappointment, I should consider the privilege of living such a moment as this to have amply recompensed and rewarded me. But I must not suffer the exultation which your generous and loyal enthusiasm has called forth, to render me forgetful of my duty to the Protestants of Ireland. The bill for the destruction of their church was accompanied by two measures such as were in old and well-remembered arrangements, termed "Wings." One was a loan to the clergy, another, a census of the people. From the impunity conceded to crime, and the encouragement held out to agitation, the ministers of the Church of Ireland—Sir, I thank you, I beg to correct myself, (M) in times like these we should assert all our privileges—the church of England in Ireland —had become acquainted with want in its most distressing forms. To afford them some little relief, the Legislature granted a loan for which the revenues of the debtors should be the security, and which was to be collected by government from tithe defaulters. It was conceded, at the suggestion of a Roman Catholic member, that these defaulters should not be chargeable with costs on the proceedings against them, and thus an unwise encouragement was held out for resistance. As was naturally to be expected, resistance was given, but notwithstanding all disadvantages it was overcome, and the tithe was in rapid progress of payment both to government and to the private creditor. Just at this period—at this crisis it may be said—Lord Althorp made a declaration that government would undertake the payment of tithe and all arrears. This declaration produced the natural, if not the desired effect. Payment of tithe became suspended—to seek it would be, in appearance, to refuse to debtors the favor which the benevolence of government prepared for them. It would have rendered the clergy gratuitously unpopular. I hold in my hand a document containing returns from parishes in various parts of Ireland confirmatory of my statement, that it was the intervention and the promise of government which checked the payment of tithes. (N) In due time the measure which had been promised, which was waited with anxiety, and not without a confident hope that it would not belie the promises which had induced the clergy

to expect relief from it, was brought before Parliament. It was a bill wholly inadequate to the expectations raised in those who awaited it—a bill which granted a loan of a part of what was owing to the disappointed and duped creditor, on condition that he renounced all claim to the other part, and that he should collect and repay—or repay, without collecting—the debt thus disadvantageously contracted. In most instances, the clergy were without resource—Lord Althorp's promise, on which they relied, had rendered it unbecoming in them, even if it were practicable, to recover their dues. It is now sometimes said that government had collected the debts of a former year at such an expense and trouble that they felt it expedient to discontinue the attempt. A most unworthy defence, indeed. If it were thus expensive and difficult, why require of the clergy, as they were, when smitten from their ascendancy about to do—why require of the clergy to do what they had themselves found so nearly impracticable? But the truth is, that at the time the tithe proceedings were discontinued the difficulties had been overcome —the machinery was fixed, and the work of recovering debts could be prosecuted with increasing facility. However, the clergy were in the net, and the greater number were constrained to accept the loan on the very unfavorable terms on which it was offered. Hence it may have been expected that they would yield a passive assent to any bill which might be introduced against their church. (O)

The other measure—the census of the people was, for the first time, to discriminate the population according to religious opinions. It was, confessedly, a preliminary to further tampering with the church, and was to furnish ground for considering whether her endowments might not admit of further reduction; so that when the juggle of the temporalities bill became apparent, and it was found that a fund, amounting, perhaps, to forty thousand pounds, could not pay, in the first instance, one hundred and forty thousand to the state, and then sixty thousand for the indispensable requisites of Protestant worship, there might be an opportunity to propose a new saving, by removing the candlesticks from some condemned parishes,

and providing, so far as law could provide, that the sound of the Gospel should be heard there no more. (P)

I have now submitted to you the statements to which I proposed to confine myself, and I will detain you but a few moments longer. You can judge of the warfare waged against the church, and see that it is of a peculiar character. It seeks to combine into one system the oppressiveness of severe legislative enactments and the aggressions of popular violence. It seeks to combine them, in a manner, I venture to affirm, unprecedented in the annals of your country. In ordinary cases, where any injury, however slight, is done by form of law to an individual or a party, the justification offered is some alleged error or misconduct with which the party aggrieved stands charged. In the instance of the church no defence of this nature has been set up. We have no wish that a single delinquent of our body should be screened from justice. We have no desire that any claims of ours which pass the straitest limits within which law or justice would confine them, should be admitted as good, or even concealed from the indignation which if wilfully urged, they would deservedly provoke. But the complaints respecting our church are not that its ministers are criminal, or their claims excessive. The violence of its enemies is admitted as an argument against its acknowledged rights, and, for the first time, it is recognized as a maxim of legislation, that the object of law should be to remit the penalties and remove the fears which had of old kept the strength of evil-doers in check, and to transfer them to the upright and unoffending.

For proof of this, I appeal to every creditable testimony which has been borne respecting the church establishment in Ireland during that period in which it has occupied a prominent place in the discussions of the legislature. I appeal to evidence taken before parliamentary committees appointed to investigate the case of the church—evidence establishing the extreme moderation of the claims advanced by its ministers, and confirmatory of that good fame which the habits of their benevolent lives had acquired. The ministers of the Church in Ireland, from its highest dignitaries to the curates in its most obscure and unfrequented districts, have been as it were prominently public so far as publicity is dangerous.

The vigilant and severe scrutiny of adversaries has been upon them, and the slightest deviation from propriety has not passed unnoticed. We rejoice that this has been so, but surely it is not unreasonable that we should claim of the impartial and the favorably disposed, that they will look to the result of the scrutiny which our enemies have conducted, and give us the benefit of it. Wherever offence has been brought to light, let the offender meet his deserts—but let the Church of England have its deserts too, if a jealous and malignant enquiry into its character and conduct can find nothing censurable, on which its ministers of every degree have not proved themselves ready and forward to bring down merited condemnation. The persecuted clergy of the established church in Ireland (I may speak of them, for I have not shared in their afflictions) have had, so far as testimony to their worth could bestow it, many a comfort in their affliction. And yet, although compliments have mingled with the condolence offered by parliamentary committees—although confessions of desert have been extorted from enemies—although those who are among the noblest of our noblest rivals have given praise, and we must for ever retain in grateful remembrance the generous panegyrics of Dr. Chalmers and Dr. Cooke—yet, were I allowed to submit the case of the church to a jury of twelve honest men—I would reserve for the private congratulation of friends—the testimony which it might seem that friends had borne—and I would submit, as the only evidence on our behalf which I held it necessary to adduce, the accusations of our most malevolent enemies.

But irreproachable conduct is not now recognized as a ground for claiming protection. The aspect of suffering seems to have awakened sympathies with the persecutor, not the injured; and, as if a contagion of wrong-doing had passed from the lawless to those by whom law should be upheld and administered, sworn advisers of the British Sovereign strive to conciliate the enemies of British connexion, and therefore the enemies of that church which is its stay; not by convincing them that their hostile efforts are unjust and vain, and causing them to know that they are perilous and discreditable, but by co-operating with them in projects which begin with threatening the church, and which, if successful in the

first attempt, will end in the dismemberment of the empire. I will not detain you with proofs of what is now so notorious that it cannot be disguised—that the destruction of the church is contemplated as among the means necessary to effect a repeal of the union. If there be any who doubt, I would refer them to the columns of those journals which are, in Dublin, organs of the two sections, the lay and ecclesiastical, of the repeal party—to the *Freeman's Journal,* and the *Pilot* and *Register* papers. I will not imagine you unacquainted with this unquestioned truth; but I will conjure you by that hatred borne to us, because of our well-known attachment to England—by the articles of union which we have faithfully laboured to maintain, to listen to us when we solicit, as of right, your strong and affectionate support. You will not forget or disregard assurances pledged, when the Protestants of Ireland gave up the privilege to legislate for their church, that its interests should not suffer from the relinquishment. You will not think it a light matter that assurances to this effect were advanced as arguments during the discussion of the act of union, and when it was carried in the affirmative, were embodied in its articles. You will not be reconciled to the treachery which would, by fair promises, win from the Protestants their power to protect a great national establishment, and then abuse, for its destruction, the privileges, which, in honorable confidence they had confided to your keeping. We tell you that the Protestant establishment in Ireland was unfairly put upon its defence; that in a country where a culprit accused of the most heinous crimes can have his trial postponed, because of hostile excitement fomented against him among the people from whom his jury was to be selected, a similar justice was denied to a persecuted church. We will tell you that it is likely soon to be placed on its trial again, and we beseech you, as you value justice and the honor of old England, be on the alert, that you may secure to us the judgment of an honest jury. It is the common cause of all we plead—the rights of men, the hopes of Christians. Be up and doing. I would supplicate our fair auditors, to remember that they too have a duty to discharge—keep all, who respect your characters and acknow-

ledge your influence, in mind, that they owe our menaced and persecuted church protection—that we have taken their engagements to be our friends, in lieu of national independence—and that we will never regret what we have surrendered, so long as we continue to receive the fraternal support it has purchased for us. Let no man henceforward be a representative in this country, who will not bear in mind, that he must oppose the fraud, and fury, and bigot vengeance which would make a howling wilderness of Ireland. Look upon us, for we are troubled. Respect us, because it is for you we are hated—and be it your resolve, and make your resolution known, that you all will withstand the assault of your enemy and ours—that you will meet him where his first parallels are laid, and will include the loyal Protestants of Ireland within your lines of defence.

At a Meeting held in BRISTOL, in the HORTICULTURAL ROOMS, on Wednesday, November 26, 1834.

Alderman DANIEL in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN—Gentlemen—I wish I could, in suitable terms —and they would not be unsuitable if they adequately represented my feelings—speak my sense of the favours we have received since we appeared in this country on behalf of the persecuted Protestants of Ireland.

Had we listened with credulity to the discouragements addressed to us, we should not have undertaken a task which was represented hopeless. It was said by our enemies, England will not add to her embarrassments by protecting the church in Ireland; she will feel danger near enough to her own, and will not augment it by undertaking a cause in which she does not feel a lively interest. Representations of this character did not dishearten us. England, we said, has already made her election. She has incorporated the Irish church with her own. A compact has been made: Ireland surrendered legislative independence — England promised powerful and benevolent protection; and, even if the difficulties which demand her succour were greater than they are, we firmly believe that the English are not a people who will revoke a promise, and violate an engagement, because the keeping it is attended with inconvenience. On the faith of this assurance we obeyed the wishes of the Protestants of Ireland that we should lay their case before you. That we should be received with good will we were confident; but our most sanguine expectations have been surpassed by the warmth of your fraternal and encouraging reception. Henceforth, per-

haps, the enemies of Protestanism in Ireland may be more chary of predictions that you will disregard your engagements.

They seem now to have transfused their spirit into adversaries who are here, and who describe my Rev. friend and myself as persons who are guilty of some heinous offence in coming to solicit your support. I can with perfect sincerity affirm, that to him, as well as to myself, the thought of appealing to you in the manner we have been deputed to do, was one to which we submitted only from a sense of constraining necessity. Far more acceptable to me it would have been to remain engaged in the occupations and studies in which, for many years, I have found happiness; but when it became a very doubtful question whether the Protestant church in Ireland would be permitted longer to exist, there seemed to remain no excuse for refusing to undertake any lawful duty by which protection might be provided for it. We, therefore, submitted to the wishes of our persecuted brethren, and the reception with which you have favored our appeal on their behalf, encourages us to hope that it will not be unsuccessful.

And here I consider it expedient to premise an important fact, namely—that the statement of their grievances which the Protestants of Ireland have made, or, to be more exact, which have been put forward at their late meetings, remains uncontradicted. I do not, of course, mean to say that we shall, in all the minor details, be found to have stated, with a degree of accuracy which admits of no correction, every circumstance to which we have referred; but I mean to say, that the substantial matter of our complaint does not admit of denial or alteration. We say that there is a conspiracy extensively organized in Ireland, having for its end to extirpate Protestanism, and to separate our country from Great Britain. We say that there cannot be found in the character or conduct of the Irish Protestants or their creed, any thing by which the enormity of this monstrous confederacy could be excused or palliated—and we have proof in the silence and in the personal calumnies of our enemies, that they regard our complaints as subjects of anger and vituperation—but dare not challenge attention to them by hazarding a direct contradiction. I shall continue to repeat this assertion wherever I have opportu-

nity, so long as our adversaries remain silent as to the character of our complaints, and are lavish of personal abuse on those who are under the necessity of making them.

May I, in a spirit of, perhaps, over carefulness, explain here a statement of my Rev. friend—that in Ireland there is a congregation of one thousand Protestants for every church. You did not, I am sure, misunderstand the statement; but to prevent all misconception or misrepresentation, I would beg to say, that it contemplated an average on all churches, not the congregation of each. It is to be lamented that there are parts of Ireland in which the Protestants are few, but it is not to be imagined that even in such parts the duties of the clergy are less arduous than in places more favorably circumstanced, or that they are less discreetly or zealously discharged. In such places I could point out many whose houses were the centres from which charitable assistance was distributed widely, and without distinction of creed or party. I could enumerate many individuals whose whole lives were spent in acts of unostentatious piety and benevolence—individuals who left no competent provision for their families—who had provided no resources for the evil day that of late came upon them, not because they had expended their incomes in sumptuous living, but because they had devoted to objects of charity all that exceeded the demands of simple habits—all that was left, after a moderate, and I might say, a frugal expenditure in their homes. I could speak of an individual who, during his life, I would almost venture to affirm, never contracted a debt for himself, who at least was exceedingly careful to avoid debt, and all occasions of it, and who became seriously embarrassed by obligations incurred in his endeavours to mitigate the evils of famine in his neighbourhood. He was more impressed with the sights of misery which met his eye, than careful not to exceed the bounds within which in prudence he should have limited his efforts to afford relief; he was for eight years, I believe, paying by instalments the debts, to him serious, which he had contracted, in his benevolent exertion. I cannot trust myself to speak of the manner in which he was rewarded.

Let it not be supposed, that in observations of this character,

I am advancing what I consider arguments against the correction of any abuse which shall be found to exist in the Irish branch of our church establishment. Far be from us the idea, or the imputation. Let every thing be done which can render our church a more efficient minister of truth—everything which can increase her activity, so far as is consistent with her order and permanence —everything which can enlarge her sphere of usefulness. This is what the term reform appears to me to mean; this was the meaning assigned to the term at the time when a reform was called for in the British House of Commons. The measure desired was to render that house more efficient for the great purposes of general amelioration. Is this the character of the reform which is desired for the church? Is it with a view to increase its efficiency reform is called for? Who are they who most clamorously demand it? I learn from the Irish prints that a society has been instituted in Dublin for the purpose of effecting church reform—by whom? By individuals who believe that a man who dies in communion with the chruch of England dies without hope—dies without a title to be saved. Are we to believe that such individuals can entertain the cruel desire to see such a church increased in power —to see its temptations for the perdition of souls rendered more prevailing? (A)

But some may say, it is not fair to impute to gentlemen connected with the church of Rome the uncharitable opinion, that out of that church salvation cannot be obtained. The liberal spirit of the age has mitigated the bigotry of the church, and softened the uncharitableness of its members. I can only say, that, according to the doctrine of the church of Rome, none can be saved out of her communion—that all who entertain an opinion at variance with this doctrine are not Roman Catholics; and I protest against giving to any men the advantage of challenging respect for their complaints on the pretext that they are bigots, and retaining respect for themselves, or the contradictory assurance that at the same time they are enlightened and liberal men. If Roman Catholics are true to their creed, they believe that a Protestant cannot be saved. Can they desire to increase the efficacy of a Protestant church? If they believe that salvation is not so limited,

they are not Roman Catholics,—and they should determine on the form of Christianity which they themselves please to adopt before they address themselves to the reform of ours. In short, if they are bigots, they cannot desire to see our church improved—if they are liberals, until they have chosen their creed, they should, in common propriety, remember, that they have no concern with our church.

But it is doing injustice to the wisdom of the self-styled church reformers to suppose that their aims with respect to the church were vague or indistinct. Reform is a convenient name. To reform to extinction they hope to find a feasible project.—They have read history more profitably than some who defer to their suggestions. The statement which my reverend friend submitted to you they know to be the truth. These statements, you will remember, comprised a view of our church under what may be considered contrasted experiments. They exhibited it during the days when it gave ground for censure; and during the more favoured period when it became the subject of almost universal praise. They also served to show that the season of sorest poverty was that of most general complaint; and that, as the endowments in process of time approached a competent provision, the efficacy of the church was also extorting more general acknowledgments. My friend also showed you, that so long as the charge of inefficiency could justly be advanced against the church—a charge which, we confess, was not altogether unjustifiable from various causes, even when she had obtained a moderate endowment—she was free from all aspersions from our Roman Catholic opponents—as long as she was an inefficient minister in spiritual things, she was left at ease in her possessions; when she became a faithful and powerful dispenser of the truth, those who could not impugn with effect the truth of her doctrines, cried out against her temporal possessions. They know that when she was destitute of provision, she was not efficient in her ministration, and they feel persuaded that if they can reform her back to extreme poverty again, she will not be the formidable enemy of false doctrine which now they find her.

In corroboration of my friend's statement, I beg leave to read

a passage from a Roman Catholic petition, which will show the character of all the petitions presented from the members of that church, until the increased activity of ours rendered her a more painful subject of apprehension:—"And your petitioners most solemnly declare that they do not seek or wish in any way to injure or encroach upon the rights, privileges, *possessions, or revenues* appertaining to the bishops and clergy of the Protestant religion as by law established, or to the churches committed to their charge, or to any of them; the extent of their humble supplication being, that they may be governed by the same laws, and rendered capable of the same civil offices, franchises, rewards and honors as their fellow-subjects of every other religious denomination." This was the profession of Roman Catholics in the year 1806. It is conformable with the general tone of the petitions at that period; and, indeed, subsequently; but it is found that the church has of late been more efficient in making the truth known, and therefore those who, on oath, disclaimed all intention of doing her establishment an injury, are now shamefully putting forth all their energies to destroy her usefulness by the influence of their projected reform. (B)

And they have been successful in finding instruments. Their councils for reform are adopted—proposals to carry them into effect have been submitted to the nation—and I defy the staunchest adherent of the reforming ministry to name one single defect which they remedied or detected in the constitution, or character, or operation of the church in Ireland. No.—Their project of reform was simple. To impoverish was the grand principle. If there were abuses in ecclesiastical rule they would suffer them to remain, if there are defects in the distribution of church revenue, they would leave them unremedied; and they would effect such a reduction of income as should provide that, hereafter, remedy must be impossible.

But this reform in the temporalities was necessary. The church was a grievance! It is not right to require that the members of one religious communion shall pay the members of another for ministerial services which they will not accept. I had purposed to speak a few words on this part of our case, but the explanation

of my Rev. friend renders it unnecessary. He has shown you that in no case does the tenant pay—that the landlord accepted or purchased his estates subject to, and having valuable consideration for the incumbrance; and that, as if to take away all pretext for complaint, these landlords are almost universally Protestant.(C) In short he has rendered it clear, that the question should be, not, is it right to compel a man to pay for the spiritual services of one who differs from him in religious belief, and whose services he will not accept; but is it right that a debtor shall resist a just demand, and plead as his exemption that the creed of his creditor differs from his, and that, accordingly, the debt is irrecoverable. This is the form in which the question should honestly be put, and if it be no grievance to a Roman Catholic to live the tenant of a Protestant or even clerical landlord, with what face can it be pretended that the allocation of a very minute portion of the rent to a Protestant clergyman is burdensome or grievous to him.

We were once taught to hope that ample guarantees were provided for the safety of our church establishment, and that the discontinuance of what were styled impolitic and unjust exclusions, would have the effect of strengthening our securities. Again, it was said that the additional protection of an oath was afforded to us. The Roman Catholic, we were told, affirms, that he has no intention to subvert the church establishment. He is willing to swear—nay, he has sworn—that he has no such intention or desire. What more can you wish for? One thing, we replied,—that he shall abide by his oath. We said (when I say we, I mean such of us as apprehended evil from the proposed concessions,) we said, that history taught us to distrust the Church of Rome—that there was in her casuistry, a power of accommodation by which the simplest form of engagement and the strictest bonds of promise could be disguised and embarrassed, and rendered capable of admitting the widest latitude of performance; that, in short, no oath could be devised from which it was not in the power of Papal casuistry to set the conscience free. We feared, not from doubt of the sincerity of those who had sworn, or who proposed to swear, but because we knew the deceitfulness of the system which they must be instruments to uphold, and

were persuaded that so soon as oaths had effected the purposes for which it was permitted that they should be taken, influences would be exerted and sophistries devised, by which the sense of obligation would become confused and uncertain, and the oath would be deprived of its efficacy. We knew, in short, that it was a canon of the church of Rome—a canon which all who believe in her doctrines are bound to receive, that " oaths prejudicial to the church are not oaths but perjuries," and we felt that, thus, the instinct which, in ordinary cases, would cause an honorable man to shrink from the guilt and stain of a most foul crime, in the instance of a Roman Catholic, if the interests of his church required, might be an impulse causing him to recoil from truth, and to violate his sworn engagements.

We had, as we thought, a strong case to allege in proof that our suspicions were not unfounded. You are all, I dare say, acquainted with the character of the Rheimish Testament; but you may not be, perhaps, so well aware of the circumstances which attended its publication in Ireland. It appeared in the year 1816, sanctioned with the authority and name of Dr. Troy, Roman Catholic Archbishop, in Dublin; and for more than a year was, perhaps, the only document in existence from which the principles of the Church of Rome in Ireland could be authoritatively learned, with respect to the duties of Roman Catholics towards their Protestant fellow-countrymen and the government under which they lived. In the September of the following year, some of its abominable notes were extracted, and their pernicious principles exposed, in the pages of the *British Critic.* The Church of Rome in Ireland took alarm; Dr. Troy was desirous of withdrawing his sanction from the book, and declared that it had been surreptitiously obtained. A statement of this nature involving heavy censure of the publisher, Mr. Coyne, he would not endure its going forth uncontradicted. He accordingly replied to the Bishop's disclaimer, and succeeded fully in vindicating his character from the unjust aspersion. Thus we have the history of the publication of the Rheimish Testament in 1816 from an authority not to be gainsayed. The matter I have now to lay before you is still more important.

It was said, that although general councils in barbarous times had promulgated perfidious canons, and although, in seasons of severe suffering or ardent political contention, Scripture had been abused to evil purposes; yet, in the nineteenth century, it should be presumed that all foul and bigot influences of creed were mitigated by the spirit of the age; and that, wherever vile principles were made known to Roman Catholics, as taught in their church, they would be met by an instant and indignant disclaimer. This was put to the proof, under circumstances most likely to give the trial, so far as Roman Catholics were interested, a favorable issue; most likely, I mean, to produce the required disclaimer. The Roman Catholic Board was the body from which it was required; the circumstances of the time demanded that, for the advantage of their cause, for the defence of their advocates, and for the preservation of the character of which they were ambitious, it should be given without a moment's hesitation.

Arguments to this effect were advanced, in order to procure it, and they were advanced by Mr. O'Connell—you shall see with what effect. On the 1st December, 1817, Mr. O'Connell, at the Catholic Board, expressed his intention to move for a disavowal of the Rheimish notes; in a few days after, as it has been copied from the *Dublin Evening Post*, a journal which was at that day the organ of the Roman Catholics in Ireland, he moved for a committee to disclaim the Rheimish notes, and said, "that they should not let the present opportunity pass, of recording their abhorrence of the bigoted and intolerant doctrines promulgated in that work. There was not a moment to be lost. He would not remain a Catholic one hour longer, if he thought it essential to the Catholic faith, to believe that it was lawful to murder Protestants, or that faith might be innocently broken with heretics. Yet such were the doctrines to be deduced from the notes to the Rheimish Testament." It is proper that you should bear in mind, the important benefits which Mr. O'Connell has derived, from his skilful selection of words, wherever it is of pressing consequence that they should be carefully chosen. You note, therefore, as of more than ordinary consequence, his choice of the word "essential." A rash man,

or one unacquainted with the doctrines of the Church of Rome, would, on such an occasion, have hazarded the word "permitted." Mr. O'Connell's selection is an indirect testimony that, permitted, could not have been safely employed; and it would not be unreasonable to infer, that his speech bears indirect testimony, also, that he would continue in the Catholic, or Roman Catholic faith, although it permitted its votaries to think they might commit, without guilt, abominable crimes, provided it did not require of him to hold, as "essential doctrine," the same hateful principle. We have also his testimony that the Rheimish Testament having, at that time, in Ireland, the sanction of his church, taught, as necessary, those nefarious doctrines which he held to be non-essential. To proceed. Mr. O'Connell moved for a committee to disavow the notes. The motion was opposed, and it was argued that the matter should be left to the clergy. Mr. O'Connell replied, "that if under pretence of this being a political subject you stop short, the people of England will say that you had not the spirit or liberality to condemn those very scandalous notes, but that you got rid of them by a side wind." Bear you this prediction in mind, and say whether it is one which ought to meet a fulfilment. In the end, "a motion"—mark me, not the motion, but a motion—was put and carried, the words being amended, thus:—"That a committee be appointed to draw up an address on the occasion of the late publication of the Rheimish Testament, with a view to have the same submitted to an aggregate meeting."

Thus far, you observe, Mr. O'Connell was defeated. The most popular of the Roman Catholics, when opposing the worst principles of his creed, was resisted and overcome by those who, on another occasion, would have, without an effort, yielded to his dictation. But perhaps he subsequently accomplished his purpose? No. On "December 2,—The committee appointed to prepare an address on the occasion of the republication of the Rheimish notes, obtained time until Saturday next to make up their report." "On December 13, Mr. O'Connell stated that the committee appointed to prepare a disavowal of the Rheimish notes, would be ready to make their report on Thursday next."

In the former of these notices you can discern the editor of the *Dublin Evening Post.* In the latter he has adopted the expression of the speaker, Mr. O'Connell; in the former he speaks of the committee, agreeably to the terms of the resolution, as appointed to prepare "an address." In the latter Mr. O'Connell speaks of the committee agreeably to his wishes or views of what its object should be, as appointed to prepare "a disavowal."

But what was the address? Perhaps, although he was defeated on his original motion, he had sufficient adroitness to turn the defeat into a triumph, and convert the address into a disclaimer. There was no address. On December 18th, Mr. O'Connell moved "that further time be granted to the committee appointed to prepare a disavowal"—(still speaking of a task which was not confided to them) "of the Rheimish notes—until Saturday se'nnight." On that day it would seem no address was ready; for the last notice that ends this strange eventful history is in the following words from the *Dublin Evening Post* of January 18, 1818:—"The Catholic Board were to have met on Saturday week, for the purpose of deciding means to remunerate Mr. Hayes. The board, we have heard, are extinct." All these extracts have been made from the *Dublin Evening Post,* the accredited organ of the Roman Catholics in Ireland. We learn from them that the notes appended, with the sanction of the Roman Catholic Archbishop in Dublin, to the word of God, served to teach that "it was *essential* to the Catholic faith to believe it lawful to murder Protestants; that faith might be innocently broken with heretics;" and that the ablest and most popular Roman Catholic in Ireland could not prevail on the body—(usually his desire was a law)—to join him in disavowing their belief in such abominable doctrines. Now call to your remembrance the prediction that the people of England would condemn a proceeding like this, and say shall it be falsified. (D)

We have been accused of exaggeration in our charges against the Church of Rome. May I not boldly affirm that no severer condemnation has been pronounced against her than this? Notes which taught that murder and perjury are lawful, were, on the

confession of Mr. O'Connell, published, with the sanction of an archbishop in his church, as comments upon the Scripture; and the Roman Catholics of Ireland could not be influenced by the eloquence and authority of their leader, to relieve themselves from the imputation of having added their approval also.

We have been accused, and I, by name, have been accused of exaggeration. I spare you notices from our Irish adversaries. I shall, because of the purpose which it serves, beg leave to quote a passage from an enemy in England. The *Courier* of October 25, contains the following passage:—" That the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan and others, should hunt out exaggerated reports of former cruelties, only to keep alive that animosity which it is their first and chief duty as ministers of the Gospel to assuage, teaches us a lesson which will not be lost on mankind." Now this journal, and in the very same number, if my memory serve me aright, reviews the pamphlet—from which you have heard passages read—of a Roman Catholic clergyman, Dr. O'Croly; and when you remember that he describes his flock as consisting of individuals who cannot be persuaded to think murder a crime, or that there is any thing culpable in endeavouring to exterminate those who differ from them in religious opinion, you can judge whether there was much of candor in charging any thing I could possibly write or speak,—and I have always written and spoken without intemperance,—with exaggeration. Is it possible to exaggerate the odium of a case such as Dr. O'Croly has described? There was another topic on which, perhaps, I might be inculpated—I mean that which has respect to a Roman Catholic oath of qualification—if I had not the power to adduce, in my defence, the testimony not of Dr. O'Croly, but of my accuser, the *Courier*. I quote from that journal the following words, " If he, Mr. O'Connell, were to confine his exertions, he being a Catholic, to obtain the overthrow of the Protestant Church, which must be to all members of his creed, as now constituted, a great grievance, we should not see any thing to blame in his exertions." He being a Catholic!—It was as being a Catholic, meaning Roman Catholic, Mr. O'Connell swore this oath—" I do swear that I will defend to the utmost of my power, the settlement of property within this realm

as established by the laws—and I do hereby disclaim, disavow, and solemnly abjure any intention to subvert the present church establishment as settled by law within the realm." As a Roman Catholic, the *Courier* pronounces that Mr. O'Connell is not blameable for endeavoring to overthrow this church, which appears protected against him, by an oath as unambiguous, and which ought to be as binding as any which man has ever voluntarily undertaken. To scorn the restraint of such an oath, is not, in a Roman Catholic, blameable. I boldly appeal to common sense—was ever a more withering stigma branded upon the church of Rome than this—branded by an advocate? Was ever fuller acknowledgment given that, in that church, the spirit of Lateran and Constance is at this moment awake? If a man be a Roman Catholic, he incurs no blame by despising his oath, provided it be for the interest of his church that he disregard the obligation. Worse than this has not been said of that church; and this has been confessed by her advocate the *Courier*.

There is another point in which our allegations have been corroborated by the testimony of our opponents, which I beg leave to notice. In the returns procured by the wise resolutions and the active exertions of that distinguished individual to whom Mr. Boyton alluded, and whom I also am proud to call my friend, Dr. Martin, the relative proportions of Protestant and Roman Catholic property were set forth. The returns when we left Ireland were not complete. Few parishes in the parts of the country possessed exclusively by Protestant gentry, had made returns; and I have no doubt that, when all have been sent in, property will be found in the possession of a Protestant proprietary in the proportion of thirty to one. On these returns the *Courier* observes—"Of course the Conservative Society already prides itself much on the quantity of land which belongs in fee simple to Protestants," &c. &c. "To correct this information, the Catholic *Morning Register*, and other morning papers, step in and observe, that how much of this Protestant rent is mortgaged to Catholics cannot be known." I would observe, that for our purpose it is not necessary that it should be known. It was not our object to ascertain, as a matter of curiosity or pride, how far Protestant

exceeded Roman Catholic possessions—but how far the burden of tithe was borne by the Protestant gentry. With this inquiry it is evident that the collateral topics introduced, to correct it, had nothing to do. Tithe is a deduction from rent—not from the income secured by mortgage. We, therefore, did not inquire who were mortgagers or mortgagees, because both were, as such, unconcerned in the matter we were desirous to ascertain, namely, who paid the tithe. I have, however, noted the remarks quoted from the Roman Catholic papers for another purpose. In the returns which Mr. Martin called for, there were two columns which, it would appear, the *Courier* and the "Catholic papers" overlooked—the columns which described the proportions of Protestant and Roman Catholic charities. Now, these vary in a still more remarkable degree than the proportions in property. Suppose then the statement correct that the unknown amount of mortgage gives ground for supposing the properties of Protestants and Roman Catholics nearly equal, what shall be said of the immense, and, in that case, inexplicable disparity between the sums expended in charity by members of the two churches, for the almost exclusive advantages of Roman Catholic poor? How is this to be explained, and how is it to be understood that the difficulty was overlooked? Was it the passion of strife or pride, or the influence of a merciless creed, which turned away attention from the neglected column, and would not suffer a glance to be thrown on the records of the unobtrusive virtue?

But, to return to the subject from which I digressed: The *Courier*, which assigns as one reason why the violation of an oath, or the evasion of a sworn engagement, should not incur blame, that the transgressor is a Roman Catholic, offers another which may be regarded as an apology, or an extenuation, namely, that to a Roman Catholic the Protestant church in Ireland must be, as now constituted, a great grievance. It has not been explained how this can be. On our part I conceive it has been very clearly shown, that in a financial point of view the church cannot be accounted a grievance—that the tenant has more than an equivalent for his tithe in the reduced amount of rent—that the land-

lord has an equivalent in the reduced amount of purchase,—(as even advertisements in the public journals abundantly prove, in which, when lands tithe free are offered for sale, the immunity is always carefully noted;) and that, passing from recent purchases to ancient grants, it is fairly presumed that an ample compensation was made for the liability to tithe in a commensurate enlargement of the grant which bestowed the encumbered lands. In a financial point of view, then, the church is not a grievance. But other things are to be considered. Although men's worldly interests remain uninjured, their feelings and their consciences may be affronted and hurt. It may be so;—and let it be proved that the church of England outrages feeling and conscience in any one instance by an insolent exercise of power, and I venture to affirm that none will be found more forward than her ministers to procure redress. But where are the instances? We do not compel individuals not of our communion to be present at the services of our church. We do not intrude into domestic privacy, and sow dissension in families by denying the rites of the church wherever our exactments are not complied with. Do we introduce discomfort into wedded life, demanding the separation of husband and wife where their religious tenets are not the same, or excluding from all the offices of religion the member of the church of England whose children are not brought up within the pale of our communion? Do we thus exercise a tyrannical control, and is there no protection against our despotism? Do we lead forth our processions through the public ways, and compel all passers-by to do them reverence? Do we exact of Roman Catholic subjects of the realm any such reverence as, on our foreign stations, subjects and soldiers of the British Sovereign are required to exhibit, to ceremonies which they have pronounced idolatrous? Does the church in Ireland exact an outward acknowledgment like this?

It is very rash to speak of the "domination of the Protestant church." I will show you where domination is. A gentleman residing in the West of Ireland, distinguished for his excellent qualities, and availing himself of the advantages of character and station to do good, considered it as among his duties to diffuse, as widely as

he had power, the blessings of Scriptural education; and became, because of his desire to be thus useful, the object and almost the victim of assassination. The assassin who had succeeded in his attempt on the life of this gentleman's servant, expiated his offence on the scaffold. When about to die, he deplored his failure to destroy the master also, and said, "If the Bible in Mr. Synge's pocket turned the bullet from his heart, it was not his fault, he had done his best." Although dangerously wounded, Mr. Synge recovered, and, in consequence of the state of the country, and the danger to which he was especially exposed, a guard of police was stationed in his house. He committed an act of hospitality. He afforded shelter to two individuals whose occupation it was to read portions of the Scriptures to such persons as pleased to hear them—and who were represented to have exercised themselves thus for the benefit of some persons assembled at a funeral. It is unnecessary to say that any attention to them must have been wholly voluntary—they could neither allure nor compel by improper influences—indeed they are not accused of having exerted any. The parish priest of the place addressed a letter to the Irish government, complaining of this conduct, and received a communication in reply, instructing him that, unless Mr. Synge denied to the Scripture reader the shelter of his house, the protection of the police should be withdrawn from him. I make no comment on the character of a government from which a decree like this issued forth; but, I ask, with such a fact on record, is there any difficulty in determining what church is that which holds haughtiest dominion? (E)

I would ask, also, whether circumstances like these do not manifest the unreasonableness of that commission to number the Protestant people, which excited in Ireland so much amazement and alarm, and which has been, in this assembly, commented on with so effective eloquence. You have heard of the agencies which are at work in Ireland. You have observed from the treasonable oaths which have been read to you, that the conspirators in Ireland are made executioners for heretical pravity. They are "to put down land-jobbing and heresy"—land-jobbing and heresy joined in the one clause, so joined, in all probability, be-

cause detected in the same individuals; and it may be, that, frequently, when we know not the cause of a poor man's death, (when his fate is set down as one among the proofs that the conspiracy has not a sectarian character,) he may have fallen a victim to the suspicion that he was about to renounce his creed. Was that a time when it was right to issue such a commission—to pluck the secret of his design, yet immature, from the heart of a man to whom it was certain death to reveal it, or to freeze an unformed purpose by terror which his faith was not yet strong enough to combat.

This, sir, is a circumstance not sufficiently regarded. I would not hesitate to give the most solemn authentication to my belief, that there are multitudes in whom it is a struggle between faith and fear—or a conflict between their judgment and some temporal interest or affection—whether they will embrace Protestantism, which, they are convinced is truth, or endeavor to reconcile themselves to the Church of Rome, in which many influences would detain them; but in which they cannot find peace. Is this a time when the people are to be numbered, and contending sects discriminated? Is it irrational to anticipate that men, who have been commanded to discharge Protestant servants on pain of being accessory to their deaths, shall reply to an enumerator's enquiry, that their household are of the required religion? Is it irrational to imagine that, at such a time, many a threatened Protestant may take upon him an appellation which he in heart detests, and, even to the minister of his church, may repeat an untruth, and proclaim himself a Roman Catholic? Who knows not the numbers, who, during the insurrection of 1798, embraced, what they accounted, the abominations of Popery, and endured the priests' baptism as an antidote against the pike of the rebel. But now, there is no such ceremony to be endured—only the utterance of a false name—only the utterance of an untruth! shame—undying shame to the men who have exposed our poor unprotected Protestants to the necessity of this cruel alternative. In a country where, during the administration of our reform ministry—the assize was adjourned, because justice could not be attained—where, it was confessed, that in cases where the rights of

the church were concerned, it was idle to expect justice from a jury, or that witnesses would aid in procuring it—a country in which the massacre of Carricshock remains unavenged; is it in such a country—at such times, before such a jury, the church itself shall be put upon its trial, and the parties who are to testify in its favor, shall be marked out for the malice of men without mercy or remorse, who hold her name in abhorrence, and to whose power her witnesses are surrendered? Shame upon those who can consign noble-hearted men to this cruel and inglorious martyrdom.

It is an easy thing for persons who sit at ease in their possessions, in a protected and peaceful land, to dismiss from their thoughts, the fears and fates of humble men, whom it serves some transient purpose to thrust into an arena where they shall stand in jeopardy every hour. And it is easy for those whose hearts the shadow of alarm has never crossed, to speak of the fearlessness with which a man is to do his duty, and affix to his name the designation which his conscience prefers; but it is not easy for any unacquainted with Ireland, and with the wrongs, and insults, and menaces, with which, where their numbers are few, poor Protestants are persecuted, and by which their numbers are reduced, to value, as it deserves, the holy devotedness with which these high-minded men have been stedfast to their faith; to judge of the struggle between conscience and human affection of the poor man, who with the certainty that he must either prove false to his church, or provoke the fury of her enemies—thinks of a defenceless abode, ready, it might be said, for the incendiary—of the helpless family to whom it gives precarious shelter—remembers stories of midnight conflagration and outrage; ponders on the deeds of which ruthless natures are capable; and with the furnace before him, heated seven times hot—will not serve the gods of those who have heated it, or fall down and worship the image that the King's ministers have set up. Noble-hearted men—your God whom ye serve is able, and he has delivered you—yea, he will convert your enemies.

But what shall be said—what expression of condemnation is deep enough to describe men, who pledged, repeatedly, to the

support and defence of the church—shall avail themselves of the tumults which now prevail, and have prevailed in Ireland,—of fraud and force—of the temporary success of hateful conspiracy, of murder and flame, to elevate what they have declared an idolatrous church, and to make the rolls of Protestantism seem scanty. And on the showing of these rolls it is to be determined, whether the Established Church in Ireland shall be deprived of its endowments. Upon the showing of these rolls it is to be decided, whether in any district, places of worship shall be closed; and although the entire expenses of the worship and the income of the minister may be accruing from the property of a Protestant gentleman, whose desire it is to reside as he has resided upon his lands—who accounts the opportunity of attending divine worship, and securing for his children and dependants religious instruction and the sacraments of his church, an equivalent for the ample provision made out of his property for the church and the minister; although he may be one of those pure-minded men who have done themselves and their cause so much honor, in the boldness with which they have placed themselves between the clergy and a lawless people—he and his house, and his Protestant friends, because their numbers may not reach the limits which enemies have prescribed, must forfeit the advantage of a religious ministration.

We surely had reason to believe that a commission like this was the work of an enemy. (F) Was it wonderful, that at a season of which it was only one of many threatening circumstances, we should be solicitous to obtain protection—was it wonderful that we should seek it from you? What were the circumstances in which we sought it? Is it not a truth, that the security of all possession, whether, life, or freedom, or property, must be precarious, if the muniments of law are not vigilantly and strongly guarded? What confidence could we place in ministers who, pledged to the careful guardianship of those sacred barriers, became supine in their exertions, and whom we behold caressing, if not conspiring with, the party which endeavoured to shake the embankments under which the nation was secure, and directed the waves of popular fury where their assault would be most

fatal? Did not the coalition of the ministry with an individual, strongly denounced, and unscrupulously eulogized, warn us of coming danger? An individual whose whole political life had been dedicated to the object of creating and inflaming hostility to the legislature of the united country—an individual whose boast it has been that he may evade or defy the law, and who, by his boldness or his craft, has uniformly succeeded in obtaining impunity to his transgression: who has approached so near to the lines of treason that traitors have sought his council, and claimed him as their own, and who so dexterously availed himself of the privileges of the constitution that he has not been brought to conviction. Was he to be made counsel to the ministry with all his hatred of Protestanism and the church unchanged, and could we be devoid of apprehension? Counsel! And to whom? To those who could match his artifice with their wisdom? No! Counsel—(I take the name they have themselves selected—cotemporary feeling may brand them with a harsher epithet; but when passionless history records the deeds of these times, it may avail itself of the more moderate appellation)—counsel to the Indiscretion Cabinet—such counsel as the order of St. Dominick would grant—counsel for the inquisition—counsel to spy out all weaknesses, and to extort all humiliating confessions.

And was it for an associate like this,—to make way for the irresponsible control of this dictator—that the courteous authority of Earl Grey was undermined by clandestine intrigue, and the ardent support of Mr. Stanley and Sir James Graham forfeited by unprincipled legislation? Was it to conciliate a ruler such as this that the honor of England was tarnished, and the welfare of Ireland disregarded—that the peace of that country was abandoned to the mercy of those to whom repose is extinction, and that a true branch of the Protestant church was to be flung into the fires which Popery had re-kindled? Was the national interest and honor to be placed in jeopardy, that any hireling agitator might, if it so pleased him, convulse the country; that he might, like the fabled wizards of the north, barter his storms for gold, selling the wind, and in a sense never before exemplified, reaping a profitable whirlwind—that he might make merchandize of the

sorrows, of the souls of a much-wronged people; that he might exact wages, earned by practices which distracted habits of industry, and inflamed feelings of disaffection; that he might agitate again a harassed and afflicted land, and,—it must be said, —not without shame to this country, and amid the darkening crimes and miseries of Ireland, gather in again his opprobrious remuneration.

I cannot allow myself to believe that measures of a character like this can find favor in your eyes—that whether you regard the honor of England or the duties of a Protestant people, you can look on calmly, and, without strong remonstrance, can permit a gospel light to be extinguished in our afflicted land, and connive at the practices of that unprecedented coalition which seems as if it had no other cement and attraction than a mutual hatred of religious truth. I will not believe that you can look on with indifference while murder, in our land, leagued with a spurious liberalism and sordid expediency in yours, is warring upon a true branch of the church of England, which even in the very hatred it provokes has acquired a new claim on your protection. Why is the church hated? What is the avowed reason why its overthrow is desired? Because it gives Protestants in Ireland a strong interest in the preservation of the legislative union with Great Britain—because it is the only obstacle to the establishment of Romish ascendancy. Therefore is she hated; therefore is a spirit of animosity called forth against her which will not discern good from evil in means to effect a great end, will never know compunction or peace, until it has been controled by a mightier power, or smitten and subdued, which it would be vain to hope, by the aspect of the ruin it has effected.

We ask you, is it at a time like this the church should be put upon its trial? And we ask, was it rash, or wrong, that at such a time, we turned our thoughts to seek your succour? We have had the assurance of our gracious King, that he will guard, to the last, the principles which placed his royal house upon the throne. Should we have approved ourselves wise or conscious of truth, if we did not make our condition known to the generous people of England, and solicit them, if they considered our re-

presentations just, to stand by the throne for the maintenance of our institutions? What would such abstinence imply? Would it indicate respect for you? Would it imply honest dependance on our cause? If we thought you a people indifferent to what was just and true—or that you had not a humane and fraternal feeling for those who pray in your tongue, and who have never been without a sympathy in your adversities and your triumphs, we know what is due to our sense of worth and honorable reputation; we perhaps might then have provoked the calumny of adversaries for not making our cause known to you, and we would have borne it with as much composure as we now allow their indignation to pass by, because we have dared to use the privilege of standing on the British soil, and have hoped, that where, even in ancient days, the fetters of the slave fell off, persecuted Protestants shall be free to speak their grievances. Have we wronged you in cherishing this hope? Confiding in it, was it fitting that we should leave our injuries unspoken?

Once, and only once, England supplicated foreign protection—when the cry of her children was, that the barbarians pursued them to the sea, and the sea drove them back upon the barbarians. That sea is now her wide and glorious dominion—those barbarous enemies, under her happy sway, have taken their place among the noblest of the human race. Her station since has been a station of power, her flag the ensign of sovereignty, and her voice has been command. The generous need not severe or frequent lessons of adversity, and England has ever been prompt to afford that protection which it was once the condition of her weakness to solicit. She has been the champion of the human race against a mighty despotism. She has listened from afar for the complaint of the slave, and smote the scourge from his oppressor's hand, and vindicated him to the rank of man. Is it only to the Protestants of Ireland her protection is to be denied? We seek no extravagant acts of favor—we implore only that you will not suffer us to be made or to remain outlaws of the constitution—that you will cause law to be obeyed—that you will protect the church which you have incorporated with your own. We do not ask of you to spare a single defect—but, we

entreat you, do not work, in the abused name of reform, the vengeance of a body which hates the church because it exists, which, the more excellent it is, will clamour the more loudly against it, and will never feel its rage abated until the object of its hatred has been rendered inefficient. Do not indulge this fell passion. Do not countenance the preposterous notion that Popery would reform the reformed religion. Encourage those who love your name, with an assurance that you are not regardless of their origin and their faith; and let the common enemy be warned, that he must not hope for your alliance in his persecutions of men whom you consider as united with you in the bonds and the brotherhood of pure and undefiled religion.

At a Meeting held in the Assembly Room in Bath, on December 6, 1834.

The Lord Bishop of BATH and WELLS in the Chair.

MY LORD, I have to express to you, and to this great assembly, my deep regret that affairs of much importance have constrained the distinguished individual with whom I had been associated, to return suddenly to Ireland. I lament the loss which our cause must necessarily sustain by his absence, and the disappointment it must occasion here. I am painfully conscious that, in such an absence, my efforts cannot do justice to the case of the Protestants of Ireland, or afford you satisfaction; but I will not allow this feeling to incapacitate me from endeavouring, however imperfectly, to discharge my duty; and I will encourage a hope that, as the difficulty of my position is increased, you will regard my defects with more than ordinary indulgence.

When it was determined, by the Protestants in my country, to send a deputation to England, the resolution was, it may be said, extorted from them, by a sense of persecution and danger. They could not be blind to the repeated proofs that their interests and the public peace were not wisely consulted for by those who exercised legal rule over Ireland; and they saw, with increasing alarm, that in the same proportion as law became despised, and legislation capricious, and the government, apparently, more supine, purposes of alarming magnitude shewed themselves more openly in the avowals of those whose enterprises they had reason to dread—and crime was perpetrated with attendant circumstances, which betrayed more clearly the system to which it ministered. They saw that, in obedience to the dictation of an

individual, the pledged enemy to British connexion, a grievous wrong was attempted against their church; and they heard this prospering enemy declare that, had he succeeded to the extent of his demands this year, he would stand upon the present success, and demand next year a further concession. (A) They learned, that the disorganized and distracted state of their country was such as to compel from a reluctant ministry, an act having for its object to restrain disturbance, and prevent crime; and they saw that the irresponsible dictator was successful in mutilating the measure so as that faction should be free. They knew the inseparable connexion between agitation and outrage; and they felt that where an excitable people were denied protection against the influences of public meetings and passionate harangues, it was of no moment that, for a time, they were restrained from outward acts of violence. (B)

How could the Protestants of Ireland behold such a state of things and not complain of the evils they suffered, and the dangers they apprehended? They saw, that, from the policy of the government and the purposes of a large portion of the people, the permanency of a religious ministration was severely shaken; security for life and property seriously diminished; and the bonds of British connexion rendered more precarious and uncertain; and then, and not until then, when their existence was felt to have become a question, they determined that they would submit a statement of their wrongs to the people of England, and ask of you, shall these things be so?

Better hopes have risen upon them since they resolved upon this appeal. The King has rescued us and you from the domination of men whose measures would in the end have led to the separation of Ireland from this country. But still the Irish Protestants feel that upon you, under God, it must depend whether their hopes shall be confirmed. They know that our gracious Sovereign is resolved, to the utmost of his power, to protect the right. They believe that he will now have as his counsellors men who will not, in scorn of every thing that is honorable and just, advise injustice because they can uphold it, and it is clamorously demanded. They know, also, that with the people it

must rest whether the ancient name of England is maintained and righteousness respected; and, therefore, they are not less careful now to take your judgment on their case, than they were earnest to obtain your support when their condition seemed more disastrous.

And let it be premised, in justice to those who have sent me here, that they do not ask of you to connive at a single defect in the structure or the operation of any one of their institutions. They ask no more than the severest justice; they feel that they have never failed in truth or affection to you; but they are satisfied to await your decision on the merits of their cause alone, and the only expectation they ground on their approved fidelity and attachment is this, that when you have seen, if you do see, justice on their side, you will assert the impartial judgment you pronounce, with the resolution and energy which, in upholding an injured friend, is characteristic of your name and nation.

I do not know whether our statements have as yet come under your notice. With your permission I will endeavor to recapitulate briefly the substance of them; and I have the more boldness in submitting them for your judgment inasmuch as they have extorted from our adversaries personal taunts, but have not provoked them to undertake the less agreeable task of endeavoring to prove that they were unfounded. But previously to laying a statement of our case before you, it is fitting that I advert to a case which has been imagined for us in this city:—otherwise I should lie under the disadvantage of a witness, who, by his silence as to some questions, lessens the value of his testimony in the instance of those he answers.

The *Bath Herald* of Saturday last contains the following passage in reference to our deputation:—"We hope that, should the above named Rev. gentlemen visit this city in their progress of agitation, some individual will, for the public satisfaction, just put this question to them—'Do you, or do you not mean to uphold that system of church government in Ireland, as it is proved to exist in the above exposé?' We should be glad to have an explicit answer." I am willing, my Lord, to imagine the question proposed, and if the editor will allow me to change one word in

its form, will give him an explicit answer. The word is "proved," —let me substitute the word "alleged;" for no one part of this "exposé" has been proved, and I answer, on behalf of the Protestants of Ireland, that "we do not mean to uphold that system of church government as it is alleged to exist in the 'exposé,'" and further, I affirm, that there is no such system for us to uphold.

I beg your indulgence, my Lord, while stating in detail the grounds of this assertion. The charges advanced against the church establishment in Ireland, as alleged in the "exposé," to which I have requested your attention, are twofold. It is said that the revenues of the church are excessive, and their distribution unfair and injudicious. I shall beg leave to consider the justice of each of these accusations.

First, for the amount of revenue. The first item in the charge against the establishment is the amount of what is called "bishops' salaries," at six thousand pounds each, and in the total 132,000*l.* The real amount, as stated by Lord Brougham, in a debate on the church temporalities act, was then 128,000*l.*, from which the following deductions are to be made, as you may read in Earl Grey's speech on the same occasion. Immediate reduction on bishopric of Derry, 4,160*l.*, future reduction of the same bishopric, 2,000*l.*; future reduction of Armagh, 4,500*l.*; produce of ten bishoprics suppressed, 50,780*l.*; tax on those which remain, 4,600*l.* Adding these sums together it appears that a deduction of 66,040*l.* is to be made from the episcopal revenues, and that the amount with which the church is to be charged should be set down at 67,960*l.*; not, as alleged in the *Bath Herald's* "exposé," 132,000*l.* The second item is the amount of tithe, which is stated to be at the lowest possible estimate 625,000*l.* If the meaning be ecclesiastical tithe, parliament has made a lower, and the committee appointed to enquire into the tithe system, has set down the gross amount of ecclesiastical tithe as not exceeding 600,000*l.* This is also Mr. Littleton's statement; and from it is to be deducted the per centage allowed by Mr. Stanley's bill, and willingly conceded by the clergy, amounting to fifteen per cent., or on the entire tithe 90,000*l.*; so that for this item, instead of 625,000*l.*, we may set down 510,000*l.* The third item is the re-

venue of deans and chapters, which is rated at 250,000*l*. This should be erased. The property of deans and chapters in Ireland should be set down at less, I am confident, than 3,000*l*. I mean, of course, as distinguished from the funds of which they have the management only, not the benefit, and from the ecclesiastical income which is included in the amount of their respective benefices. The members of chapters are also beneficed clergymen, and, as such, tithe owners, or entitled to ministers' money, in towns where such impost is recoverable. Their revenues, accordingly, are included under these items, and ought not to be a second time charged against them. We court inquiry into the matter, and boldly affirm that the incomes of deans and chapters, as such, are not sufficient to keep their cathedrals in repair. At the present moment a most necessary alteration is being effected in the cathedral of Armagh —I may say an indispensable alteration —and the expense is defrayed by subscription, the members of the chapter, out of their private means, contributing largely, and the primate, with his wonted munificence, heading the subscription list with a donation of 8,000*l*. We may then lay aside the charge for deans and chapters altogether, the incomes of the dignitaries being set down under another head, and the very small economy funds they have to manage being wholly inadequate to their objects, the maintaining cathedrals and providing for public worship. The fourth charge is for fees, and is stated at 187,000*l*. This enormous exaggeration may also be set aside. Fees are received in Dublin, and in some town parishes, but, although I have knowledge of various parts of Ireland, I do not know a single country parish in which they are paid or demanded. We may set them aside, and consider those in the next item, which is the amount of income received by rectors of parishes in Dublin and other towns who are paid by ministers' money. There are computed forty-eight cases of this kind, and it is supposed that the average income of each amounts to 500*l*. Half would be nearer the truth; but I am confident ample provision will be made for the amount of all the fees received by the clergy throughout Ireland, if we set down the clerical income in Ireland arising out of fees and ministers' money, at the amount fixed in the *Bath Herald's*

" exposé," 24,000*l.* All these are subjects on which we court inquiry. I am acquainted with some of the parishes in Dublin in which fees were paid, and I know how very moderate was their amount. In one of these, wealthy and populous, having a much-frequented burying-ground, the amount of fees did not average 20*l.*, and in another, where there were at least 2000 Protestant parishioners, and which is perhaps, the third or fourth in point of wealth in the city of Dublin, the fees, including those of burials, did not exceed fifty pounds. When such is the amount of fees in parishes where they are paid, and when you remember that throughout the rural districts there are none, you will judge whether I am not justified in expunging them from the charge against us. I may add that neither in the towns would they be demanded, but because of the inadequate provision for the maintenance of the clergy; the income arising out of ministers' money, not averaging in the gross more than 400*l.* per annum, and the crowded population rendering it necessary for the rector to have in almost every instance one curate, and in the greater number of cases, a second. The concluding item in the exposé, is one which I did not expect to see. It is a charge of 20,000*l.*, for the property of the Dublin university. Of the eight individuals among whom part of the property here rated at 20,000*l.*, and which is, perhaps, not less than 14,000*l.*, is distributed, two are laymen, and all are individuals who have qualified themselves for their preferment, at first, by most laborious study, and by success at an examination, perhaps the severest to which the human faculties are submitted, and who, after, at an average, eighteen or twenty years of painful and unremitting attention to the duties of a college tutor, are promoted to a share in the government of the college, and rewarded with an income far inferior to what they should naturally have expected had they for the same length of time devoted their talents to the acquirement of professional reputation and emolument in some other department of life. I cannot think it fair to charge this sum against the church. All professions, all creeds, benefit by the University of Dublin. Students from various countries profit by it. The country gentleman, the barrister, the soldier, the physician, as well as the minister of religion, imbibe

the advantages of its culture; and it is not correct to add the amount of property, thus generally beneficial, to those items by which a prejudice is sought to be created against the church establishment. To sum up then the amount of revenue—

For Bishoprics, according to the *Bath Herald's* "exposé,"	£132,000	By Act of Parlmt.,	£67,960
Tithes	625,000	———	510,000
Deans and Chapters	250,000	(Expunged altogether.)	
Fees	187,000	(Included in next Item.)	
Rectors in Dublin and elsewhere, paid by Ministers' Money	24,000	Including all fees,	24,000
Property of Dublin University	20,000	(Excluded as belonging to Education.)	
Total, *Bath Herald's* "exposé,"	1,238,000	Correct statement,	601,960

From this statement, it appears that the amount of ecclesiastical revenue in Ireland is less by one-half than that for which the "exposé" would hold us accountable. I do not require of you to receive this statement on my showing. I must adduce corroborating testimony; and, as my subject is rather more extensive than the limits of time within which it would be right for me to detain you, I must rely less upon the abundance than the selection of evidence which I shall lay before you. I call then, as witness on behalf of the church, a noble individual, who certainly never appeared her friend—the uncompromising reformer in all departments of church and state—the cabinet breaker—who was of late Lord Althorp. In the speech delivered by the noble Lord, when bringing in the church temporalities act, on February 12, 1833, he states the amount of church revenue thus—

Revenues of Bishops	£130,000
Ditto of Deans and Prebends—the Deans and Chapters of the *Bath Herald's* "exposé"—(we have no Canonries in Ireland)	2,000
Ditto of other Benefices	600,000
Amounting to	£732,000

And, allowing amply for any omission, the noble Lord concludes that the whole property of the church in Ireland does not exceed 800,000*l.* This exceeds by 68,000*l.* the amount for which he had assigned the specific items. Let it, however, stand. It was the

statement of one who made its amount the ground of the reductions he had to propose. It was, accordingly, as high as plausible conjecture could raise it. From this amount we are to deduct—

For the allowance on tithe of 15 per cent	£90,000
Taxation on clerical income	41,800
Actual and prospective reduction on sees of Armagh and Derry	10,650
Revenues of suppressed bishoprics	50,780
Taxation on those which remain	4,600
	£197,830

This sum taken from the amount of ecclesiastical income, magnified even as it was by Lord Althorp's conjecture, leaves it as affected by the church temporalities act 602,170*l.* If we take the noble Lord's statement of the amount to which he thought ecclesiastical revenues would extend, not that which he was sure they would not exceed, we shall have on his Lordship's authority a remainder of 534,970*l.*, which is less than my return by 46,990*l.* This, I am persuaded, is correct; at least, the approximation between the noble Lord's return and that which I have laid before you is remarkable, as you will see when I have corrected an omission in my former statement. I have not deducted from the amount of the revenues of incumbents in Ireland, the taxation to which the temporalities act has rendered their benefices liable. This taxation Lord Grey rates at 41,800*l.*, and deducting it from the amount of income which I have stated, the remainder will be 540,160*l.*, leaving church revenue, according to my calculation, less than that stated in the *Bath Herald's* "exposé" by 687,840*l.*; but greater than the amount collected from the statement of the noble Lord by 5,190*l.*

You are not to be surprised at this extraordinary exaggeration, for in truth, until Lord Althorp, in his official capacity, as cabinet minister, examined into the state of the church, he had himself been under the most mistaken impressions as to its opulence. The terms in which he confesses his error are so remarkable, and I may add, so instructive, that with your permission I will read them:—

"The public mind had been totally led astray by the exaggerated statements as to the amount of that property. He candidly

confessed that, previously to his looking more closely into the question, he himself had been deceived and led astray by the exaggerated statements abroad relative to the amount of the church revenue in Ireland. He would first come to a matter which had been much talked about, the enormous amount of the revenue of the bishops. Now, after what the house had previously heard upon this subject, they would be surprised to learn from the returns that the whole amount of the bishops' revenues in all the counties was not more than 130,000*l.* The gross amount was 150,000*l.*; but the net revenue did not exceed 130,000*l.* It was quite true that large tracts of land belonged to the Protestant bishoprics; but the bishops had by no means an exclusive interest in those lands. On the contrary, it appeared that five-sixths of those interests were vested in the tenants by whom those lands were held. The real amount of that property was about 600,000*l.* a year; but of this sum the bishops did not receive more than 100,000*l.* Some idea of the exaggerated statements which had gone forth might be formed from these returns. With respect to deans and chapters, and prebends, they were not so numerous, and were on a different footing from those of this country; their emoluments were derived in a different manner; and amounted in the whole to 23,600*l.*, but deducting from that sum the expenditure which took place before any portions of it could be divided amongst those parties, and which amounted to 21,500*l.*, it would be found that no more than 2,200*l.* remained to the whole. With respect to the other benefices he was not prepared to enter into the details. The returns had been called for from the different counties, and had been made by a great proportion of them, but not from all. The only mode he had, therefore, of coming to any thing like a conclusion on the subject was by taking the average of the returns made, and comparing them with the others. The whole amount of returns called for was 1401, of these 1149 had been brought in, making an amount of revenue of 478,346*l.*, and assuming the other 252 returns to be upon the same average, the whole amount would be 580,000*l.*, or, to speak in round numbers, 600,000*l.*, on a fair average of the whole. Now, taking the amount of bishops' revenues at 130,000*l.*, those of the

deans and prebends at 2,000*l.*, and the other benefices at 600,000*l.*, it would be found that the whole church revenue of Ireland did not exceed 800,000*l.* a year. He found it the more necessary to go into these details because of the greatly exaggerated statements which had gone abroad upon the subject, and because of the necessity of a clear understanding upon the subject previously to their coming to that calm and dispassionate consideration of the subject which its importance demanded."

It would be well for the interests of truth if the noble Lord's recommendation were attended to, and his representations of the real amount of ecclesiastical income in Ireland respected; but the task of misleading and inflaming the public mind while he was in ignorance, he felt a much lighter labor than to correct false impression and allay prejudice when he had himself taken the pains to become instructed. This happens according to the condition of our nature. The descent is easy—but to recall the step—to retrace the ways which led from the light of truth—here indeed is the toil which all feel most distasteful. Still I hope that, in time, truth will prevail; and, corroborated by the testimony of Lord Althorp, I suffer myself to believe that the statement of revenue which I have laid before you will be accepted, although it is less by considerably more than one-half than that which the "exposé" in the *Bath Herald* charges against us.

I proceed to the other charge—that which concerns the distribution of this revenue. The church, it is said, offends in three particulars—unions of parishes are improperly large—pluralities are too numerous, and curates are neglected. With respect to the first of these accusations, it might, perhaps, be sufficient to say, that every union is now virtually dissolved on the death of the incumbent, and that a re-union can be effected only by the decision of the Privy Council. But it should not be lost sight of that the bishops of the church in Ireland were foremost in directing attention to this evil—that they long laboured in their respective departments to correct it, and that, in the year 1819, they drew the attention of Government to it, and succeeded in placing the affairs of the church on such a footing that the evil may be considered at an end.

But how did it rise? Not surely from criminal indifference to the interests of religion. It arose out of the extreme poverty of the church. The consequence of withholding, at a time when there was scarcely any agriculture in Ireland, the tithe on pasturage, or agistment, was such, that a maintenance could be procured for ministers in the church only by very widely extending the boundaries of ecclesiastical benefices. In consequence, more than one or even two parishes were united, not for the purpose of rendering the incumbent opulent, but that he might have the means of existence. Times changed, the system of agriculture became more favorable to the temporal interests of the tithe owners. The unions which had once been necessary in order to provide a subsistence, became sources of wealth. It is not all at once that correctives can be applied. Vested interests must be regarded, and life will not cease at will in order to facilitate the march of improvement. But it is quite certain that improvements were rapidly effected, and none who take the trouble to inquire will hesitate to acknowledge that the heads of the church were the most forward in their promotion. Let any man look to the recommendations of the Irish bishops as to the unions which are to be divided according as they become vacant, and I defy him not to acknowledge that the church has done its duty. I do not mean to say that they recommend the abolition of all; there are unions of more than two parishes in which the entire income is less than 60*l.* per annum; but I, without any hesitation, affirm that the bishops may publish their recommendations for the dissolution of unions, and defy the keenest and most malicious scrutiny, to withhold from them the praise of disinterested and prudent counsel. (C)

The next charge is against pluralities. They have ceased. In order to hold two livings, it is necessary to have a permission from the Primate, which is named a faculty. For five years he has not issued one. He had been gradually lessening the practice for some time before, and has, from the time I mentioned, altogether discontinued it.

With respect to the third charge, that the salaries of curates are inadequate, it is one which I never yet heard advanced by a

good curate in Ireland. Complaints may from time to time be made that promotion is not rapid, but scarcely ever that the salary is inadequate. The truth is, there are many advantages in the distribution which does not hold out to an individual yet untried the prospect of a large emolument. No man enters the church because of a curate's salary; but when he has given proof, that, entering from purer motives, he is worthy to minister, it is right that he should be placed in a situation where he may assist others in learning to discharge their momentous duties. If there be any just ground for complaint that a deserving curate has been neglected, far be it from me to desire that the guilt of the diocesan who has been an unjust steward should be concealed; but I can have no hesitation in affirming, and if time permitted, it would be most easy to prove, that no curate who deserves promotion, can be found murmuring that his salary (the salary prescribed by law) is not large, or expressing with respect to his temporal prospects any other desire than that in due time he may obtain suitable preferment.

The *Bath Herald's* "exposé" illustrates its abstract discussion by three cases, to which I beg to direct your attention. One is of a gentleman, son of the late Archbishop of Dublin, (a prelate whose name is of the kind that endureth,) who has a stall in Christ Church, an archdeaconry, a living in the metropolis, and another in the county Wicklow. As to the living in the metropolis, which is, in truth, a curacy; from what I know of it and of the overflowing charities of the archdeacon who holds it, I am much mistaken if it is not merely a source of expense. I know that the archdeaconry is of but inconsiderable value, and that the living in the county Wicklow, which involved a cure of souls, has been for some time resigned. The next is the case of a son of the Bishop of Kildare, "who, (says the *Bath Herald,*) in addition to the dignity of the archdeaconry, and the possession of one of the richest rectories in the city of Dublin, holds a benefice in the adjacent county, consisting of five or six parishes united, and producing a revenue large enough to remunerate the services of four resident and really efficient ministers." As the "exposé" notices merely "the dignity" of the archdeaconry, I shall not

dwell upon the fact that it confers little more than dignity, except a solemn responsibility, and the unavoidable necessity of incurring expense as well as enduring labour in discharging its onerous duties. Its dignity and its necessary expenses should be provided for, and they can hardly be thought too amply provided by the parish in Dublin, which does not produce a clear income of more than five hundred pounds, (not four hundred after deducting the various expenses and charities which it involves,) and the union of five or six country parishes which produce under the operation of Mr. Stanley's bill the sum of 575*l.*, out of which are to be deducted the salaries of, at the least, two curates, leaving for this richly endowed archdeacon, an income of, at the utmost, 900*l. per annum.* Is this too much? I do not know what may be the judgment which the accuser would pass upon it; but, little or much, the grievance is corrected, for after the preferment or demise of the present incumbent, the union must cease, unless cause can be shown to satisfy the Privy-council that it ought to be continued. The evil may, in point of fact, be regarded as already corrected. The third case is of the rector of Granard, who holds a union of which the revenue is set down at 2,469*l.* The real net amount of revenue is 1,247*l.* The editor of the *Bath Herald* and his informant considered, probably, the value of the rectory, whereas the incumbent appears to have the vicarage. The union is set down as one of those which is to be dissolved.

May I not, now, deliver my explicit answer on behalf of those who sent me here, that they do not desire to uphold a system like that which is complained of;—and, still better, that the heads of the Irish church have been forward to remove all just grounds of complaint? On the authority of Lord Althorp, we prove that the church does not possess half the revenues ascribed to her; and we refer to the reports of the church commissioners to show that the evils of unions and pluralities are in rapid progress of correction. I thank you for the indulgence with which you have listened to my long and tedious counter "exposé." However disagreeable, it was necessary—I trust it will not prove wholly ineffectual. The church is accused of being too richly endowed; her revenues are little more than a third of the amount which is

set down against her. She is accused of having offended by allowing or making unions of parishes, and permitting individuals to hold more than one benefice. The truth is, that such anomalies arose out of the extreme poverty to which the church had been reduced; and that, in the same proportion as that poverty was relieved, the evils became corrected, until the allowance to hold pluralities wholly ceased, and unions in every practicable instance were divided. As an indication of the improvement which is silently progressing, I shall quote from the *Bath Herald's* "exposé," and from parliamentary returns, the number of benefices in Ireland, in three different years. The *Bath Herald* states, but without naming the year, that the number of benefices in Ireland was 1252; in the year 1829 it was 1293; in 1830, 1302, indicating a progressive increase in the number of benefices in proportion to the opportunities afforded for the dissolution of unions. (D) That the increase has been progressive since there can be no doubt, as the discussions in parliament relative to the deanery of Raphoe abundantly prove; and I would merely say to any who desire information as to what the church has being doing, to consult the returns of the ecclesiastical commission, and see whether every practicable dissolution has not been recommended. I will add but one remark. This commission was appointed by the Duke of Wellington. In the administration of his successor, one of its leading recommendations was overruled, and a union of six parishes, containing five churches, and yielding a gross revenue of 2,877*l.*, continued, in direct opposition to the decision of the commissioners that it should be dissolved. It was given by Earl Grey to the nephew of the reforming chancellor.

The extent to which my observations on the *Bath Herald's* "exposé" have led me, prevent me from entering so fully into the case of our church in Ireland as I would have entered under other circumstances; but I trust I have succeeded in satisfying you that the Protestant church and people in Ireland are worthy of your countenance and succour; let me now endeavour to set before you the difficulties in which your aid is demanded. Here, too, I must briefly state what we have already proved, and what remains uncontradicted, namely, that there exists in Ireland a

conspiracy of long standing, and extensively organized, having for its object to extirpate Protestantism, and separate Ireland from Great Britain.—This we have shown on the clear and positive evidence of adversaries; and all has been, since our statements were made public, still more strongly corroborated by the indirect testimony of their silence. We have shown that this conspiracy is at the present moment in powerful operation, that the oaths by which its members are bound together pledge them to endeavour the extirpation of Protestants, and that the crimes by which they manifest the spirit which is in them, are not desultory and aimless atrocities, but are acts directed cautiously and skilfully by some unknown power to which obedience is yielded. We have shown that, of late, the southern parts of Ireland seem to have been almost surrendered to the agents of this tremendous confederacy; that law has sunk into contempt, and peaceable men have been left defenceless, and that persons set in authority, instead of exerting themselves to protect the good, and to punish crime, were sacrificing all the interests of the country to propitiate partisans by whose aid their date of office could be prolonged. All this we stated, and when a sufficient interval had been allowed for its disproval if we had erred, the Protestants of Ireland resolved that they would submit a recital of their grievances to the British people, and call for, what we have to return thanks for having abundantly received, your equitable and fraternal assistance. In the mean time our gracious Sovereign interposed. He rescued (as I have already said) you and us from the domination of those whose policy was calculated to sever us from you for ever, and as it was in the discharge of a sacred duty to the church our King thus exercised his prerogative, we felt ourselves the more bound to appear before you, and show that such an exercise was called for; that the church was not undeserving of it; and that it was imperatively demanded by the imminent dangers which threatened the Protestant church and people in Ireland, and our connexion with Great Britain.

There was a time when Protestant ascendancy was talked of —it is thought of no longer; the question now is—shall the Protestant church in Ireland be suffered to exist? If you meet any

who deny that our case was, humanly speaking, almost desperate, ask them will they call for a parliamentary inquiry into the state of Ireland, and the conduct of the Irish government; into the proofs of conspiracy against the Protestant church, and the attention paid to the efforts made to expose and defeat it. I undertake to affirm, that our history does not contain the record of such a state of things as that inquiry would make manifest. Assizes adjourned because it suited not the purposes of a preponderating party to allow justice to have free course; jurors overawed in their deliberations, and grievously persecuted for the verdicts they had returned; witnesses intimidated from giving evidence, and submitting to the rigors of the law which punished their contumely, rather than encounter the merciless vengeance of those who had enjoined that they should be silent; Protestants threatened and murdered, and seeking to escape from barbarous vengeance, by assuming, what at heart they abhorred, the guise of a superstitious religion; Protestant clergymen impoverished, persecuted, murdered, driven forth, homeless outcasts; and the Irish government, while these things were so, sitting at ease in its possessions; and now, by capricious exercises of unsustained power—now by what seemed criminal connivance—exasperating the evils it dared not attempt to correct, and rendering the afflictions of loyal men more hopeless. What scenes could be brought to light of the sufferings of a persecuted clergy! Aged and charitable men compelled to swear, at the dictation of the nightly desperado, that they will forsake the home in which they hoped to end their days in peace, and turn away from the church where they had long faithfully ministered; some noble spirits lingering at the post of duty, expending from their private stores to relieve the distresses of those who belonged to the party which, so far as it had the power, was bringing poverty upon them; relieving these distresses at a time when they were forced to meet the objects of their bounty at a distance from their home, and at hours especially appointed, because they dared no longer allow an unrestricted entrance into their houses, or even encourage the approach of strangers to their doors; merciful men devoting the early parts of the day to the distribution of food or medicine, and

medical advice; and, if it were indispensable that they should leave home, choosing the darkness of night as the time of their travel, and concealing the direction where they meant to proceed, that they might avoid scoffs, and taunts, and injuries, from which no worth, or benevolence, or services had power to protect them. (E)

What a time, when men, whose going forth had been welcomed with smiles of affection and reverential greetings, for whom their large charity had secured respect in those who valued not their office; what a time was this, when, wherever they appeared, shouting and mockery arose around them, and frequent injuries assailed them, even from those who had most reason to bless their well-proved benevolence; and what a time, when a government looked on without affording protection and redress: nay, could discourage the complaints of the afflicted, by violating a confidence which ought to have been sacred, and exposing a supplicant to the consequences of his indiscreet reliance. (F) Let it not be imagined that I would lightly pronounce a censure upon any body of men, or that when their day of power had passed away, I would unnecessarily asperse the conduct of an unwise or corrupt government. The question is not yet decided. There is a party in England who would force again on the adoption of the Sovereign his late ministers. There is a party in Ireland who strongly second them. Here in England I would persuade myself that, so far as our country is concerned, the rash restorers know not what they do in lifting up again the fallen power; but in Ireland, the consequences are fully understood, and will be vigorously prosecuted. Let it not then be regarded as an unnecessary or an invidious labour to set forth the evils which followed from a most unhappy misrule, and which must be renewed in deeper horrors if the broken sway be reconstructed. Let it not be thought wantonly severe, that those who have mourned for the sufferings and crimes which such a fiction of government occasioned, shall not put their feelings to silence. What have I known of the sufferings of an upright clergy under the cruel vial which has been poured out upon them; some languishing under wounds, which render the life with which they escaped the assassin's attempt a pain and sorrow; some persecuted from their homes; their families scattered; their child-

ren, who in other times had never retired to rest without a mother's blessing, eating the bread of dependence among strangers; some lingering within the precincts of their desolate homes, lamenting the loss or affliction of sons wounded in their defence, or because they were their offspring; some murdered; and all men upon whose good name the breath of calumny never dared to shed a tarnish. Shall we think of these things, and shall we be censured when we speak of the government at whose door all are to be laid, if sorrow causes our language to be unceremonious.

Need I recal to the remembrance of any one here the case alluded to in parliament by Mr. Stanley—the case of a venerable clergyman, eighty years of age, who was cruelly murdered in the face of day, and to whose wife, when she found his dead body in blood on the ground, no one stretched out a helping hand. Need I say, that during her desolate night-watch by the mangled corpse of her husband, she was insulted by brutal knockings at the door?

But I have a story to tell of a character for which nothing in this country can have prepared you. I have have twice endeavoured to narrate it, but desisted from the vain attempt. I have, however, prescribed to myself the relation of it as an indispensable duty. Grant me a few moments' indulgence, and I will, I trust, without disgracing his memory by unbecoming weakness, tell you of Irwine Whitty and his martyrdom.

Irwine Whitty was a man, perhaps, more calculated than any human being you have known to make religion loved. He was tried with much bodily weakness and pain; he was gentle and indulgent to a degree which would induce you to think a bold effort or a severe expression impossible to him; but whatever it was his duty to do, and his duty prescribed some arduous exertions, he was empowered to attempt and to accomplish. I can remember well how, when one among the proudest and most exalted in station of his countrymen had acted in a manner to deserve rebuke, this humble minister of the gospel faithfully and eloquently discharged his severe duty; and I can almost fancy that I see him as when two of the most distinguished of his parishioners, who were known to be at variance, appeared at his communion service—he overcame the shrinkings of his modest nature, and descended on the mission, and with a face which was

as the face of an angel, that in the sight of his little congregation, the parties might be reconciled. And they were reconciled, for, were it not for the manner of his departing hence, I would say it was not in man's nature to withstand his gentle solicitation. I am the more sensible now of his worth because I have to confess that, during his Christian life, I did him one injustice. His house was ever open to me, and his wise counsel and his engaging and instructive conversation. I never entered his doors without a feeling as if I passed where no profane thought should come, nor returned from a visit to him without bearing with me an influence for good. For all this I am deeply responsible.—But I was about to speak of the injustice. I saw that his habits of life were frugal as far as consisted with propriety; I saw that his broken health needed relief and recruiting, and I believed his income large enough to allow of the necessary relaxation, and sometimes doubted whether it would not be well if he allowed himself the benefit he might derive by procuring the assistance of a curate. I was undeceived as to the means at the disposal of my revered friend when I learned that his dear family were left without any provision:—but I had previously learned enough to instruct me that thus, in all human probability, it must have been.

In a year of scarcity, almost amounting to famine, (one of those visitations by which Ireland has been not unfrequently scourged,) my revered friend was left, almost alone, to succour the distressed within the bounds of his parish, and incurred in this charitable agency what for himself and his family he almost superstitiously avoided, a debt which he was discharging by instalments for many years. It is not improbable that this debt may have become, providentially, the occasion of his martyrdom.

In process of time I became separated from my friend, but could not lose my anxiety for his welfare. When disturbances commenced in which church property and the clergy were violently assailed, my anxiety was painfully increased to learn that even the inestimable life of this good man was in peril. I had an opportunity to speak freely with him, and urged the expediency of a temporary removal from the scene of danger. I said, as I thought, that it need be only temporary. I said no government could be so lost to all sense of justice or self-respect as to tolerate

long the sanguinary excesses which were converting Ireland into something worse than had yet been realized on earth, and that law must soon be vindicated. He was not to be moved. He had considered well the entire extent of his dangers, and he felt that his duty was plain and direct. He would remain at his post. He was not insensible to the perils of his situation, and would gladly, if he could, lessen or remove them. As to his income in tithe;—to him, personally, it was of small moment that it should be reduced. If he could procure peace by allowing a reduction, which should affect himself alone, he would sacrifice much to purchase it, but he would not violate a sacred trust by alienating church property and defrauding a successor. He was in the Lord's hand, let Him do what seemeth Him good. He received my suggestions as a Christian would, but satisfied me that as to the point of residence he was immoveable.

On this occasion, he detailed to me the circumstances of the first threatening notice he had received. He was, as was his habit, after all the family had retired to rest, engaged in his sacred studies, when suddenly a report of fire-arms, so loud and near that it seemed to shake the house, stunned him. Such was the signal which usually announced that a notice had been posted. "I arose," said he, "and having satisfied myself that the noise came from without the house, opened gently the doors of the apartments of my wife and children, and looked anxiously to see if they had been alarmed. All were peacefully sleeping; and I thanked God for the mercy from the bottom of my heart."

Towards the last days of this good man's life, his dangers seemed to have disappeared. I received assurances that his saintly life and charities had produced the natural effect—but all was hollow. He had been visiting an infirm parishioner at a distance of three miles from his home; he had walked; I believe he could not allow himself the indulgence of a horse or carriage: wearied with the exertion, he attempted to return by a shorter way than that of the public road. In the fields, a sense of weariness and cold overpowered him, and he approached the house of a Roman Catholic parishioner to rest for a little, and recover warmth. He was so feeble that it was necessary to assist him over a stile which interposed between his path and the house.

It appears that he was courteously invited to enter and take a seat; that he was, on leaving the house, accompanied on his way by its master—but, after the lapse of many hours,—late in the night, he was found upon the earth where he had been stoned; mangled, and bleeding, and speechless; but not yet quite liberated from the agony of death. Thus Irwine Whitty died, a man whose countenance only, by its subdued and saintly expression, might have disarmed the wildest hatred. Thus he died, returning from a charitable office, exhausted with toil, and languishing under bodily sickness, in the fields of those who had experience of his kindness, and who knew his worth; in the sight of numbers who owed to his benevolence many a comfort in a season when, but for him, their sufferings would have been extreme; in their sight he lay for many a fearful hour in the death struggle, and none came near to minister to him, and none summoned friends to his relief. He had been ready to give, glad to distribute. He had been at the bed of fever, and in the huts where penury sought a shelter, and there was a time when blessings followed him as he went upon his offices of mercy; but in that awful day, he was looked upon and deserted in his parting agony. What fell poison must have been infused into human hearts to render them thus merciless! To him who departed, his going hence and the manner of it was of small account. He has had his crown; but it is an awful lesson to think that one thus "lovely in his life"—should lie on the earth, dying, where neither tear, nor tender touch, nor prayer, nor blessing soothed him—a witness, an unambiguous witness, that the spirit which seeks the destruction of the Protestant church is of a kind which quenches the sympathies of human hearts, and is not to be charmed into peace or mercy by all the gentleness and all the virtue that is bestowed upon the most blameless of mortals.

There was the show of a trial for this portentous crime. Two individuals were arraigned for the murder, and when the principal witness, as it would seem, was brought forward, he refused to give evidence. He was commanded, he said, to make oath that he would refuse; and when the judge explained to him that such an oath could not bind his conscience, and therefore that he must bear testimony to the truth, the poor man proposed the pertinent

question, " Must I be shot, my Lord ?" and finally showed which obligation and which government he thought the stronger, declaring that he would go to prison rather than risk his life by becoming a witness. The culprits were acquitted, and the village from which the merciful man had been taken away, celebrated, it is said, the acquittal, by a general illumination.

Is it wonderful that we should strongly complain when such things as these afflict and affright us? Is it wonderful that we should have distrusted a government which, while a conspiracy was raging against Protestantism in this most merciless spirit, instead of exerting every strong power to quell the evil, ministered to it, by proposing to number the Protestant people, and thus expose them to the hate and fury of monsters without conscience or pity. Was this a time when men could be expected to declare themselves of a religion the profession of which rendered them liable to visitations of unsparing vengeance? Was it possible for the government to find persons who would dare to make a census in Roman Catholic districts, unless the known sympathies of the people were in their favor? Was it reasonable to expect that magistrates could entrust the office of enumerator to any individual whose known political bias, or whose religious profession was not of a kind to win good will, or to disarm suspicion? Who that valued human life, or would not provoke crime, had dared of late years to take upon himself so grave a responsibility? And what were the encouragements to return correct answers as to religious belief?—Let law be enforced in Ireland—let the rights of conscience be respected, and then number the people. This is all we ask. Let us not lose the benefits of British connexion; let us not be looked upon as outlaws.

But is it not a question, whether we have not already lost these benefits? In petitions from my country imploring you to guard the bonds of connexion, I have repeatedly seen it assigned as a reason for the prayer, that Ireland must otherwise become the battle-field whereupon contending nations would decide their conflicts. This was the worst evil which was dreaded from separation; and I do not hesitate to affirm that a far more fearful evil is found compatible with what is called a union. Look to the reports which recount, imperfectly and partially, some of the atrocities by which

Ireland is now afflicted. Look to the representation ascribed to the late Chief Secretary for Ireland, declaring that the parts of the country where the Church of Rome prevails, should be traced in blood-red colours upon the map—and that, on an average, he received accounts of three murders every two days. Look to the reports from a late privy council in Dublin, at which the Lord Lieutenant of Tipperary (a county to which the Irish government long denied the benefit of the coercion act) gave in returns of crime, and showed that in that one county, in the space of only two years and five months, five hundred and sixty murders had been perpetrated; (G) and then say whether any state of things can be imagined more dreadful than that which prevails at this moment. War!—A battle-field! I remember well when the brave and high-spirited gentry of the south of Ireland, would have hailed, with acclamation, war, open, terrible war—in their own fields,—if it were a change from a gloomy, fiendish spirit of assassination, the blackest curse before which ever nation withered. War! If it have its terrors, it has also grand compensations. It calls out noble bursts of human energy,—lights of tenderness relieve it,—and it is glorious in the loftiest qualities by which our unchanged nature can be adorned. The fields which it has signalized are separated to a peculiar honor—pilgrims visit them—and their names are spells to awaken those deep and proud emotions which are among the high mysteries of our being. But where murder steals out with coward stride and fell purpose—where he withdraws to his lair, and no indignation smites him—I am weak and wrong—where murder becomes the great animating and debasing principle—where it frowns the puny affectation of courts of justice into contempt—where its baleful presence is attested by more victims than angry war demands or numbers—where the fall of every victim is a most fearful crime, and brings a curse and a cry of blood upon many criminals—there is a state of things having less to compensate its evil than comes in the train of battle. And this is the state of the southern provinces of Ireland. War would be better. Who would not rather go forth with the Emperor of France to his battles, than abide amid the revolting butcheries of Robespierre or Marat? And who that reflected would not rather see Ireland the battle-field of civilized war than the shambles which it has been made for murderers.

We appeal to you, shall it continue thus? Let it not be any longer the debateable ground on which contending parties in the state shall wage their political battles. Whether Tory or Whig (H) or Radical exert himself to keep it in so afflicting a condition, make him feel that you will not suffer men's lives to be thus slightly regarded—crimes of the blackest character to be perpetrated with impunity. Make him feel that the interests of Ireland must be cared for, and are of more moment than the triumphs of party contention, and that you will not suffer Protestants to be rooted out, and their religion to perish, because they have maintained an unconquerable affection for this land of their fathers. We beseech you to protect your Protestant fellow-subjects of Ireland, and see that the religion in which we pray, in the same tongue as yourselves, is not swept away from the face of our island. You owe this to your character—to the station in which you have been providentially placed—which you have not declined to occupy. Britain entered into her sorest and most perilous conflict, not impelled by precipitate zeal,—not influenced by sordid interests—but to maintain high principle—as the champion of truth, and liberty, and order; and when she arose from the struggle, crowned with the holiest laurel that ever decorated a victor's brow—when every region of the world displayed memorials of her triumphs and echoed with her fame, it was not for such sights and sounds she looked and listened. She dallied not with false and self-seeking complacencies. She did not abandon to luxury her honorable repose. She bethought her of the duties by which power is accompanied and governed. She bethought her of the darkness which covered nations—and of His appointment who had given her glory, and "set her on a hill." She heard the voice—"Whom shall we send, and who will go for us;" and she was ready to answer—"Here am I—send me." Therefore, "people that sat in darkness," in the remotest regions of the earth, "have seen a great light." Can she who preached the Gospel in distant lands, aid in extinguishing the faith which she solemnly contracted to defend,—at home, among brothers;—or connive at the operation of a system which even while men say "Peace—peace," has made Ireland "a field of blood."

NOTES.

NOTES TO ADDRESS I.

(A).—Page 1.

The Earl of Winchilsea, who accompanied the Earl of Roden to the meeting, and who has entitled himself to the lasting gratitude of the Protestants of Ireland, not less by the wise and seasonable council he recently conveyed to them, than by the generous ardor with which he has always maintained their cause.

(B).—Page 5.

Nothing here said, it is scarcely necessary to observe, was designed to convey any opinion as to the personal character of the Right Hon. Secretary. Neither his motives, nor his talents were intentionally underrated; nothing was questioned, except the policy he adopted in his government of Ireland. Countries have been won, and wars decided at less expense of suffering and crime, at less waste of human life than Ireland suffered during the period in which it endured his forbearance, and paid the penalty. It would seem as if there was some secrect influence which turned aside the course of his legislation, or warped his judgment while he held office. When he retired from the government, he had the manliness to retract his erroneous opinions, and to acknowledge the necessity, then visible to him, of adopting more rigorous measures than those he had tried. The future historian of Ireland will find that Mr. Grant's government has had an influence of great moment upon the destinies of the empire; that it sowed the seeds of the mighty changes which have of late years been effected, and the still more memorable, which seem likely soon to follow.

It was said that he paid little attention to the communications of country gentlemen, and that in consequence, they became disinclined to furnish information. The following extracts from the report of a debate on the suppression of disturbances in Ireland, in 1834, may be found worthy of attention:—

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 1834, vol. 24, p. 1235. (*Commons.*)—Mr. O'Reilly said, &c. He (Mr. O'Reilly) had submitted to the Right Hon. Gentleman, now the member for the University of Cambridge, (Mr. Goulburn,) documents, which proved the organization of a complete scheme for the disturbance of the county of Cavan, in order to induce the government to renew the insurrection act, and to secure the calling out of the yeomanry, to be placed on full pay. Those documents were now in the castle of Dublin, and showed the spirit in which information was sent to those charged with the government of Ireland. He had the letter of the Right Hon. Gentleman, the President of the Board of Control, refusing to act upon the information in this respect, though without any new evidence to inform his mind, the then Lord Lieutenant (the Marquis Wellesley), called for the renewal of the insurrection act; a measure which had thus been declined by the then Secretary for Ireland, and his predecessor in that office, &c.

Mr. Charles Grant said, &c. The Hon. Member (M. O'Reilly) had been somewhat incorrect in his dates, in what he had said as to his conduct in parliament. It was in 1819, and the commencement of 1820, that disturbances broke out in Galway, and during that winter strong efforts were made to induce him to propose the renewal of the insurrection act, which he resisted. In 1820, the question came before the House, and the House gave its opinion, and the question was set at rest. The Hon. Member appeared to have forgotten that he had quitted Ireland in 1821, when the question about the renewal of the insurrection act again came forward. It was discussed in March and April, having been brought forward late in February, when he was no longer a member of the government, acting then, in his individual capacity, when he could not be supposed to be in any degree influenced by the government. What was his course? Upon consideration

of the papers laid before parliament, he did feel himself called upon to vote for the measure, notwithstanding his previous impressions. He acceded to the revival of the insurrection act, because he was convinced, that great as were the evils which it inflicted, those which it prevented would be still greater if left unchecked.

(C).—Page 6.

It would be an unprofitable, because an unnecessary task to enumerate the various occasions on which Lord Plunkett pronounced the church establishment the stay of British connexion, or to recite his numerous declarations of attachment on his own part, and his undertakings on behalf of Roman Catholics. It has been sometimes urged by the noble Lord, and those who acted with him in his advocacy of Roman Catholic claims, that had their success been obtained at an earlier period it would have been unattended by the evils which have followed the too tardy concession in 1829. But in that year they were just as confident in their assurances to the country, that the Roman Catholics would swear not to disturb or injure the church establishment, and that the oath thus given in sincerity would prove an ample security to Protestant institutions. There certainly was no backwardness on the part of Roman Catholics to yield the required pledges, but to this hour, there seems to be an insurmountable objection in the minds of the swearers or their sureties, to explain the inadvertency or the contrivance by which the oath was discharged of obligation. The following passage is from a speech of Lord Plunkett, in the year 1829.

" The Archbishop of York candidly bore testimony to the virtues of many Roman Catholics with whom he happened to be acquainted. Other peers bore testimony to the character, integrity, and honor of the Roman Catholics: well, then, these persons were willing to swear, and by this measure they were willing to swear, that they have no hostily to the Protestant established church. Now it was certainly rather an awkward kind of argument to say, that a man is most respectable in private and domestic life, and a very excellent moral character, and yet he is

not to be believed on his oath. He could not exactly understand a noble peer who would say "You are no doubt a very honorable man, but I shall not believe you on your oath." But if you could not believe the oaths or assertions of the people, could you believe their acts? But it had been contended by many of the opponents of concession to the Catholics, that if they were honest and sincere in the belief of the religion they professed, they must be hostile to the Protestant establishment. Those who argue in this manner, seemed to think that an establishment was a principle of religion; but that remained to be proved. An establishment was not a principle, but merely a political institution, which some thought had been unwisely connected with religion; but he thought differently and considered the connexion both wise and necessary; and if the thing were to be done again, he would say, let there be a church establishment. Sure he was, that if the alternative were put to him, the Roman Catholic would prefer the Protestant establishment in church and state, under which security was offered to his property, his family, and his life, to the wild and mad chimerical attempt to uproot the Protestant establishment, *which could only be done by shaking the foundation of the empire.*

Hansard, vol. 24, 1834, (*Commons*) p. 1160. The following passage was quoted from a speech of Lord Plunkett, by Mr. Stanley.—"With respect to the Protestant establishment of the country, he considered it necessary for the security of all property. He thought that there should not only be an established church, but that it should be richly endowed; and that its dignitaries should be enabled to take their stations in society." (Hear.) He was glad to hear that cheer, and especially from the hon. member for St. Alban's, because he hoped that he concurred in the Lord Chancellor of Ireland's opinion, "that its dignitaries," Lord Plunkett continued, "should be enabled to take their stations in society with the nobles of the land; but, speaking of it in a political point of view, he had no hesitation to state, that the existence of the Protestant establishment was the great bond of union between the two countries; and if ever that unfortunate moment should arrive, when they should rashly lay their hands

upon the property of the church, to rob it of its rights, that moment would seal the doom of, and separate the connexion, between the two countries."

(D).—Page 6.

Hansard's Parliamentary Debates, 3rd series, vol. 25, p. 920. August 4, 1834.—Mr. Secretary Rice "considered that man the worst enemy to Canada who should promote a separation from the mother country, as the means of obtaining redress of grievances whether real or imaginary. Entertaining such opinions, he could not help feeling the deepest regret that the sentiments contained in a letter which had appeared in the public papers, purporting to have been written by the hon. member for Middlesex, should have emanated from any member of the British senate. In that letter he found the following passage:—"A crisis is fast approaching in the affairs of the Canadas, which will terminate in independence and *freedom from the baneful domination of the mother country,* and the tyrannical conduct of a small and despicable faction in the colony."

Mr. Hume admitted the letter, and insisted that "he had given very wholesome advice" in it. "He would say to Canada what he said to Ireland. If you cannot obtain the redress of great and acknowledged grievances, then *resistance becomes a virtue,* though the difficulty is, where to draw the line. He was as much interested in the peace and welfare of the Canadas as any man in that house; but he could not sacrifice his principles and his public character on any private consideration."

Mr. Secretary Rice observed, "that a member of parliament enjoying his perfect security in Bryanstone Square, was not in a fair situation to recommend the inhabitants of a distant colony to adopt measures of resistance of the description to which the hon. gentleman alluded. Why did he not take the field and expose himself to the consequences, instead of playing the part of the trumpeter in safety at home. Let the hon. member, if he incited resistance contrary to law, meet the consequences, and he hoped the law would lay hold on him."

Mr. Hume does not appear to have been in all instances so

incapable of discerning epistolary misdemeanors. In his report on Orange Lodges, he quotes the following passage from a letter written by Col. Fairman :—

"It is a lamentable thing that the Government is so short-sighted, is so wilfully blind as not to encourage Orangeism in the army, which would operate as an additional security for the allegiance and fidelity of the soldier on all occasions; but the ministers of the present day are holding out premiums for disloyalty to subjects of every class." This sentence is quoted in the Report of Mr. Hume's Orange Committee, as deserving of censure, although it was qualified by an expression which does not appear in the Report, but which is found in the Appendix where Col. Fairman's letter appears without mutilation :—"Recollect, in the mean time, that the best duty of a good soldier is to obey."

Cato's severity began at home—the foreign department of the great Roman's virtue is probably ample enough to task modern ability. To be "*Dimidium Catonis*" has its merit.

(E).—Page 7.

Lord Brougham.—"The evil was created, because those men preferred to honest industry, and its creditable and honorable gains, a life of restless agitation, supported by a species of personal as well as political mendicancy—a state of existence which, such was the honorable feeling implanted in the mind of man, never failed to engender, even in those who were driven to it by unavoidable necessity—a feeling of internal shame." Then, after his memorable allusion to the story of Dante, the noble and learned Lord proceeded :—"I trust, my Lords, there are few, gifted with such genius, who will long suffer the shame—who will long brook the indignity of such humiliating courses, or who will long, by such means as these, in order to perpetuate such base and unmanly support, continue to plunge their country into discord."—*Northcroft's Parliamentary Chronicle.*

A comment so direct as this was scarcely necessary to illustrate the meaning of passages in the King's speech such as follow : "I have seen with feelings of deep regret and just indig-

nation, the continuance of attempts to excite the people of that country (Ireland) to demand a Repeal of the Legislative Union," &c. &c. " To the practices which have been used to produce disaffection to the state, and mutual distrust and animosity between the people of the two countries, is chiefly to be attributed that spirit of insubordination which though for the present in a great degree controlled by the power of the law, has been but two perceptible in many instances." The speech concludes with a prediction, that if the excitement be successful, "it must inevitably prove fatal to the peace and safety of the United Kingdom." Do his new friends think Mr. O'Connell has forgotten, or that he forgives?

(F).—Page 8.

The word " farce" should have been " cant."

Hansard. Agricultural Distress, Feb. 31, 1834. Mr. O'Connell. —" He would tell the House who had increased incomes; those persons who were proprietors of the public debt. They got three times what they were entitled to. The interest of the debt must be reduced. It was 29,000,000. Let the noble Lord strike off one-sixth of the interest and that would give him four millions and a half to begin with; let him then come and reduce taxation to the amount of four and a half millions. He heard a great deal of talk of justice and national faith, and every thing else. Talk of the cant of national faith indeed," &c.

Mr. Secretary Stanley—" Had heard the other night with some surprise, of the pretext of an Act of Parliament; but with infinitely more astonishment did he now hear the learned gentleman talk in a British House of Parliament of the 'cant of national faith.' He granted that the mode in which the present repetition of that expression was received, and the tone of contemptuous derision with which it had been originally met, fully vindicated the House from the charge of partaking in any such absurd or profligate opinions." &c.

Sir Robert Peel—" Rejoiced to hear the hon. and learned member for Dublin avow his political creed, because when they came, in a few days hence, to the consideration of the Repeal of the Union, they would bear in mind under what auspices, and with

what views that measure was proposed." "O all you!" exclaimed the Right Hon. Baronet, "who have interest in the funds in Ireland. O! all you Protestants who hold lands in Ireland, learn by this timely declaration, what your fate will be when you shall have been delivered up to the tender mercies of a popular assembly, returned by the influence, and adopting the principles of this man, who makes a jest of national honor, and talks of the *cant* of public faith.

I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word.

The question of the Repeal of the Union had been decided by that preliminary declaration. Who that had any thing to lose, would not draw the inference, that if such slender pretences could be brought forward to justify the violation of national faith, there could be no security for any property of any description."

(G.)—Page 9.

"And here he must be permitted to advert to the deep feelings of pain and regret which he (Mr. Littleton) must ever feel when he reflected, that by the indiscreet course which he had permitted himself to pursue in disclosing the opinion of the Irish government, he had been the means of inflicting on the country the great and irreparable loss of the services of Earl Grey."

The indiscretion which broke up the government of the noble Earl has been rendered so important in its consequences, that a brief notice of it seems not unnecessary.

On July 1, 1834, Earl Grey proposed in his place in the House of Lords, a renewal of the Coercion Act for Ireland. "Prædial disturbance" and political agitation had been so plainly connected in the King's Speech, that it was a matter of course to find the clause which gave the Irish government power to prevent meetings for purposes of excitement retained in the new Bill. "It was impossible," repeated the noble Lord, "for any one to suppose, that these political harangues, as they were called, could be addressed to the people without stirring up among them a general spirit of resistance to the constituted authorities, and of disobedience to the laws, which broke out in excesses such as had been witnessed in Ireland, and which it was the object of the

measure he recommended their Lordships to re-enact, to prevent," &c. &c.

On July 3, Mr. O'Connell demanded of the Chief Secretary for Ireland, " whether the statement in the newspapers, that the renewal of the coercion bill in its present form had been advised and called for, by the Irish government, was correct." He asked also, whether it was the Secretary's intention to bring in the bill into the House of Commons, and on learning that " whoever brought it on, Mr. Littleton ' would vote for it,' " observed in words not to be forgotten; " Then I have been exceedingly deceived by the Right Hon. Gentleman." It was upon this occasion that memorable altercation between these honorable members amazed the reformed House of Commons, and gave rise to discussions in which the secret proceedings by which Earl Grey was circumvented, became to some extent exposed. Mr. Littleton, after consultation with Lord Althorp, had confided to Mr. O'Connell his belief, that the forthcoming coercion bill was not to contain a clause enabling government to put down political agitation. Mr. O'Connell, relying on the Right Hon. Secretary's communication, suffered the government to proceed on its way unmolested. Mr. Littleton had communicated also in confidence with the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, and endeavoured to procure from him a recantation of the opinion he had officially announced, that without the disputed power he could not carry on the government. Lord Wellesley, in compliance with this clandestine suggestion, declared that he would endeavor to content himself with the mutilated bill, that he would, in short, halt on as well as he could by the aid of the broken reed that was prepared for him. This also, without the knowledge of Lord Grey, or even of Lord Althorp, Mr. Littleton confided to the Liberator. The consequence was, the retirement of the head of the government—the abandonment of the obnoxious clause in the coercion bill, the adoption of a policy of which Mr. O'Connell approved, and finally, it is said, to that gentleman a large increase of " rent," and to Mr. Littleton a peerage. Mr. O'Connell, as soon as Earl Grey had been actually displaced, was willing to condole with Mr. Littleton, whom he had previously accused of falsehood, and

wished that "a double share of blame" should fall upon him, rather than that the Secretary should be censured. There is little more to be said. The combined indiscretion of these two gentlemen prevailed, like a successful stratagem, against Earl Grey. They have each had their reward:

Ille crucem—hic diadema;

"the one has the coins and the other a title."

The account given of a part of this transaction by Earl Grey should not be omitted.

"On the 23rd of June, I received a letter from the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, a private and confidential letter," &c. "This letter, I say, appeared to be produced, not so much by any original view taken of the state of Ireland, as by certain considerations which were suggested to the Lord Lieutenant from this country, without my knowledge or concurrence; *considerations affecting rather the political state of parties in this country, than of Ireland.* I thought the view taken in that letter was completely erroneous." Lord Howick, in the House of Commons, asked of Mr. Littleton, whether he had consulted with any person before addressing the secret letter to the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland; but the Right Hon. Secretary did not think it convenient to give an answer. What a state of things—when the protection of the lives and properties of his Majesty's subjects in Ireland, is postponed to the convenience of political parties in Great Britain!

(H).—Page 11.

To those who are uninitiated in the mysteries of parliamentary tactics, it seems unaccountable, that certain members are permitted, without rebuke or correction, to utter their crude notions respecting the title, and the incidents of ecclesiastical possessions. They assume, that there was a transfer of possession from the Church of Rome, and that even at this day Roman Catholics have no equivalent for their tithes. The latter assumption is now left to the more daring, the real liability to tithe in the pro-

prietor having become notorious. The other assumptions should be more frequently and more boldly questioned. When an honorable member affirms that the state transferred church property from Romish to Protestant ecclesiastics, he should be called on for proofs. It would be injustice to Mr. Lefroy, member for the University of Dublin, to omit noticing the clearness and power of reasoning, with which he has repeatedly exposed fallacies on this subject. The question will be considered in another place, and more at large, in these pages.

(I).—Page 14.

" Now, he" (Lord Chancellor) " should like to know, could the clergy repay the government advances, if this bill were not agreed to? And he would have clergymen, who had estates, bear in mind, that the government had a general security on all this property for the repayment of the loan of last year. Nor would it be in the power of the government to remit payment, for the law compelled them to enforce it."—*Hansard,* August 11, 1834. —The part which the declarations of the Chancellor of the Exchequer had in promoting the war against tithe, is well known. The reader will find in a future page a reference to it.

ADDRESS II.

(A).—Page 20.

The Ribbon system, Mr. O'Connell declared, was a continuance of defenderism. It has an organization similar to that of the United Irish system, but has, as the learned gentleman observed, the bad peculiarity of religious exclusion. The oath by which its members are bound, Mr. O'Connell also declared, in his parliamentary evidence, in 1825, is, in the neighbourhood of Orange lodges, of a sanguinary character, threatening the destruction of Orangemen. In the letter of the learned gentleman to the Duke of Wellington, he speaks of a million of Irishmen impatient "to get leave to fight" Protestants; who are, he says, including maimed and halt, and blind, a tenth of their number. Mr. O'Connell speaks of having prevailed on forty-seven Ribbon lodges to dissolve; and he gives notice to a lodge which met in Dublin, that he is aware of their proceedings—of their keeping two sets of books, one which contained faithful reports of their proceedings—another by which the police were to be frustrated.

(B).—Page 20.

The Orangemen of Ireland—have dissolved.—Mr. O'Connell courted them until he found they were intractable. If they would join him in seeking a repeal of the Union, they might rely on his friendship. They were, he declared, the only obstacle to his

complete success. With their aid, in twelve months, he could have a parliament in College-green.

(C).—Page 20.

Evidences of the truth of this proposition will be given in future pages. Mr. O'Connell declared that, as the Orangemen would not be won, they must be conquered and put down. It is impossible to deny him the praise of prudence and consistency, in his persevering efforts to remove the stumbling-block in his way—nor should it be denied that England has given him a most self-renouncing support in his endeavors to raze her fortresses.

(D).—Page 23.

See the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Reily, before a Parliamentary Committee, in 1825, of Mr. Barrington, and the Rev. Mr. Connor, in 1832.

(E).—Page 24.

Of late the honorable and learned member, seems to have adopted new views on this subject. He is reported to speak eloquently of the sufferings of the poor; in a tone which some might think menacing of the titles by which the wealthy hold their estates in Ireland, and to justify himself for renouncing the opinions he formerly entertained, by the defective character of such titles, and the extremity of suffering among the indigent. Two circumstances may have conspired to enlighten him. The priests of his church have, of late, devoted much of the time spent in their conferences to questions respecting titles to property, &c. Commissioners appointed by government, have sought out the distresses of the Irish people. It would not be bad policy to declaim in behalf of the poor, before the commissioners gave in their reports. It was respectful to bestow some thought on a subject which, the "Ordo divini Officii" for 1835 proves, occupied the attention of the Romish Clergy, namely, the requisites for just "title and possession."

(F).—Page 27.

The evidence of the Inspectors of Police, on the secret conspiracies which have so long afflicted Ireland, is of great moment. An accurate memoir of the testimonies on this subject, from the year 1760, to the present day, would be a valuable addition to Irish history. Two extracts are subjoined, one from the evidence of Major Warburton, in 1824, another from "Pieces of Irish History," by Dr. M'Nevin, on the constitution of the United Irish Society, of which he was a distinguished member.

Digest of Evidence. (*Lords.*)—May 26, 1824, *Report*, p. 133.—"Major Warburton.—Two baronies of the county of Clare, adjoining the county of Limerick, had been placed under the Insurrection Act. (p. 141.) About four years since, a system of organization was introduced into these baronies, which has continued in operation from that period. It is called the Ribbon system, and is to be distinguished from those disturbances which are occasioned by the transfer of lands, and by other local causes. The objects of the conspiracy entered into by Ribbonmen, are to establish the Roman Catholic church, and extirpate Protestantism, and to separate Ireland from Great Britain; and as an inducement to the people, to unite with them, (p. 152,) they have promised, that when successful, they will establish a kind of agrarian law, and make an equal division of all the property over which they shall have acquired dominion. (p. 143.) To excite attention to their views, and encourage the peasantry to embrace them, extracts from the prophecies of Pastorini were circulated through the country in a cheap form, and the circulation of them has been attended with such success, that a very general expectation was created of some great change, which was to take place in the year 1825. (p. 142.) The propagators of the Ribbon system avail themselves of any local disturbances, for the purpose of introducing their own principles, and it is invariably found, that where disturbances are of long continuance, they lose their desultory character, and are methodized into a political organization. (p. 160.) The outrages are of three kinds, some

arising out of motives of private revenge; some perpetrated for purposes of intimidation; and some directed, on the principle of the Ribbon system, against Protestants. (p. 140-1.) These last-named outrages, and the apprehensions so generally entertained of the effort to be made in the year 1825, have caused many Protestant farmers from the county of Limerick to emigrate. It was in the year 1820, witness became acquainted with the Ribbon system, and it has continued in operation since that time, with but one short intermission, which occurred at the time of his Majesty's visit to Ireland, when, in consequence of the death of the late Queen, (p. 146,) the conspirators imagined that the English radicals would withdraw from them a support on which they had previously relied, and leave them without a power of accomplishing their designs. Witness places much reliance on the information he received, (p. 154,) because it was corroborated by the result of his most diligent enquiries, and because the two persons who gave him his most particular information (p. 153) were murdered, under circumstances which intimated that these deaths were in consequence of the communications they had made. Two papers sent down from Dublin, came into the possession of witness; one containing the Ribbonman's oath, (of which the objects are already mentioned,) and the other containing the system of organization. (p. 146.) No individual was to swear more than thirty-six persons, who were to be considered a body within themselves, and were to have a committee-man, a treasurer, and secretary, belonging to them. The committee-man was to communicate with the committee-man of another lodge; but no one of the thirty-six knew any thing beyond his own particular circle. The committee-men of the various lodges assembled occasionally in Limerick, and met the delegates sent down from Dublin, to whom they were perfect strangers, and of whom the same man never came down more than once. At one of these committees, at a time when the Insurrection Act was in successful operation, it was proposed, that, as there was little to encourage them, and as the measures of government were so strong, they should abandon their designs, and permit the disturbances

to cease; but on the other hand it was contended, that as the time was near (p. 149) when the prophecies were to be fulfilled, they ought to wait for it; and until that time had passed over, they would not yield to those who wished them to give up their arms, but would retain them still. Whatever be the explanation, it is certain, that of arms collected to a very considerable extent, (p. 151,) (though not in such abundance or of such quality, as to make an insurrection formidable,) the quantity given up is very trifling indeed."

It will be well, remembering the declaration of Dr. M'Nevin, and Mr. Emmett, that some hundred thousands sworn United Irishmen, continued steadfast to their purposes, after the Rebellion of 1798 had been put down, to compare the account of the modern Ribbon confederacy, with that of the United Irish system, as detailed in the following abstract of its constitution.

Pieces of Irish History, p. 101.—"It first states the object of the Institution to be, to forward a brotherhood of affection, a communion of rights, and an union of power, among Irishmen of every religious persuasion, and thereby to obtain a complete reform in the legislature, founded on the principles of civil, political, and religious liberty. It then proceeds to the rules of individual societies, such as the admission of members by ballot; the raising of a fund by monthly subcriptions; the appointment of a secretary and treasurer by ballot, once every three months; the election by ballot of two members from each society, who, with the secretary, were to represent it in a baronial committee; the regulation of some minor internal affairs; the taking of the test by every newly-elected member, in a separate apartment, in the presence of the persons who proposed and seconded him, and of a member appointed by the chairman; after which, he was to be brought into the body of the society where he was again to take it publicly; the splitting of every society amounting in number to thirty-six, into two equal parts—the eighteen names drawn by lot were to be the senior society, and its delegates were to procure from the baronial committee a number for the junior, according to which it

was to be classed and recognised, and its delegates received by that committee; no society was to be recognised by any committee unless approving of, and taking the test, and amounting to seven members; lastly, was laid down the order of business at each meeting. From these societies committees took their origin, in an ascending series; the baronials consisted of their immediate delegates. When any barony or other district should contain three or more societies, it was determined that three members from each, appointed as already mentioned, were to form a baronial for three months. In order to preserve the necessary connexion between all the parts, no committee in any new barony or district could act until properly constituted: for that purpose the secretary of the senior society was to request a deputation from the nearest baronial, to constitute a committee for that barony or district. When the number of societies in any barony amounted to eight, in order to prevent the committees becoming too numerous, it had a right to form another baronial, but each was to represent at least three societies. That none might be unrepresented, baronials were empowered to receive delegates from the societies, of a contiguous barony, which did not contain three. The baronials were also to correspond with societies or with individuals, who had been duly qualified as United Irishmen; and any business, originating in one society, should, at the instance of its delegates, be laid by the baronial before the others. The county committees were to be formed when any county had three or more baronials, by two persons from each, to be chosen by ballot for three months; and until that took place, the existing baronial in any county had liberty to send delegates to the adjacent county committee.

"Provincials were in like manner to take place, when two or more counties in a province had their committees, by three from each, also chosen for three months by ballot; and where a provincial was not yet constituted, the county committees were to send delegates to the nearest provincial. The national committee was to consist of five delegates from each provincial. The names of committee-men were not to be known by any person but those who elected them."

(G.)—Page 30.

The following is the account of this melancholy incident which appeared in the newspapers. It has been repeatedly affirmed, and never, as far as I have been able to learn, contradicted.

"About three o'clock, on Monday, the four men convicted on Friday evening, for the murder of Patrick Donnellan, were executed at the front of the new jail, Ennis. They severally acknowledged the justice of the sentence awarded against them. John Casey said it was not the first, or the second, or the third time, that he deserved the fate that now awaited him. Patrick Hartigan allowed he was present at the murder, but denied that he loaded the gun. Peter Donnelly acknowledged also the justice of his fate. Morty Quinlan said, if he were offered pardon he doubted would he accept it. He never did any thing in his life that he had to charge himself with, and for that he was now to suffer, *he hoped God would forgive him, he only endeavoured to rid the country of a man who was disturbing it for the last nine years. It was he who fired the bullet at Mr. Synge, and if the Bible stopped it, it was not his fault.*" These wretched men, it will be seen, profited by all the insidious advice given them, and he who was held forth as an enemy to the peasantry, their country, and their God, they conceived they were doing God's service, by going forth to murder him. This will, we hope, be a warning to those who are not yet called to account, how they proceed in the same unhallowed course, as those who went before. Upon whose head rests the blood of these victims to crime?

(H.)—Page 32.

On the subject of perjury, the following observation of Chief Justice Bushe is instructive and important. "It is a melancholy truth, that two species of demoralization seem to be going hand in hand together in this country; one manifesting itself in the fidelity with which unlawful oaths are observed, and the other in the violation and contempt of those oaths that are lawful and taken in the administration of justice."—*Special Commission, Maryborough,* 1832. How the horror of blood can be obliterated from

the heart (for the man who thinks it justice to destroy life for the good of his religion, soon ceases to feel repugnance at taking life) can be gathered from the dying words of the Clare assassin. Both these subjects shall be more amply considered.

(K.)—Page 36.

The chronology of confederation has been fixed with tolerable accuracy, and it has been clearly ascertained that the Orange Institution which was formed in September 1795, four months after the completion of the New United Irish Constitution, and when the country had been harassed for a long series of years by systematic crime and outrage, was purely of a defensive character. It is a remarkable circumstance, that Wolf Tone, who kept a journal in Ireland to the year 1795, and continued it in France for some time after, never once names the Orange Institution; while the Editor who has published his Memoirs, completing the history of the times from such testimonies as were accessible to him, gives hearsay reports of the conduct of Orange Societies two or three years previously to the date of their formation.

(L.)—Page 37.

The excesses of which the address of Lord Gosford complained, are now understood to have been grossly exaggerated, misrepresented, and, at all events, most falsely ascribed to Orangemen. The truth appears to be, that various motives influenced many individuals to emigrate suddenly from the county of Armagh, and it does not appear that the Protestants were at all culpably concerned in their removal. Wolfe Tone, in a Memorial to the French Executive, describes Armagh as one of the four or five counties in which the organization of Defenders was most complete. He describes the system as co-extensive with the rural Roman Catholic population, and thus renders it easily intelligible that the fear of being detected may have operated on many who were never harassed by any other alarm. Dr. M'Nevin admits that at the fight in September 1795, which was the occasion of forming the first Orange Lodge, the Roman Catholic party laid themselves open to a suspicion of treachery, having

violated a truce which their successful adversaries had made on the first day of the engagement. Dr. M'Nevin excuses the violation on the ground that it was the act of a party unacquainted with the preceding compact. But, to omit this, it seems not irrational to imagine that when Protestant vigilance was aroused, the fears of those who owed penalties to the law might also be on the alert, and they might have thought it desirable to escape impending danger. It was no bad policy, under such circumstances, to cover their retreat under the protection of an outcry against Orangemen. The speech of Mr. Verner in the Irish House of Commons in defence of the Protestants, received no answer; and although the parties who accused them and who declaimed upon the flight of several hundred individuals, were called upon repeatedly to mention the name of even a single sufferer, the appeal was suffered to pass in silence. The omission was surely remarkable; it ought to have been instructive.

That the Orangemen were wholly unconcerned in the excesses of the time has now been clearly established. The witnesses produced against their institution during the late parliamentary inquiry, have established their innocence. One witness stated, that these excesses were at their height four months before the Orange Society had existence. Another, a Roman Catholic, stated that the party with which the Orangemen had sometimes been confounded, had in considerable numbers merged into the United Irish system; and Lord Gosford, who appeared as a witness against the Orange Society, by his evidence, completely acquitted it of having caused the long hackneyed and misunderstood complaint of his noble father. The following is part of the noble Lord's evidence:—

"Your lordship was examined yesterday respecting a speech reported to have been delivered by your father in the year 1795; will your lordship have the goodness to take the book in which that speech is reported; there was a series of resolutions adopted by the magistrates, and signed by the names of several persons. Your lordship gave evidence respecting the gentlemen whose names were signed, some who, you stated, were staunch Protestants, and others who became bishops—does your lordship find

any Presbyterian among them?"—"I cannot speak positively to the fact," &c. &c.

"Does your lordship see in that the names of any who either were Orangemen at that time, or became Orangemen afterwards?"—"I do. I rather think Robert Bernard Sparrow was an Orangeman."

"He was a connexion of your lordship's?"—"He was a brother of Lady Gosford's."

"Does your lordship perceive any other who afterwards was an Orangeman?"—"James Verner, I think—but I am speaking from conjecture—and Stewart Blacker," &c. &c.

"In that speech of the late Lord Gosford, your lordship's father, there was the passage, 'A lawless banditti have constituted themselves judges of this new species of delinquency.' Does your lordship imagine the persons pointed at in that passage, the lawless banditti, were Orangemen?"—"I believe I stated before that I cannot say they were Orangemen," &c. &c.

"Your lordship did not mean to intimate that the parties pointed at in that speech were Orangemen?"—"No: I am sure I did not intend to give any such evidence; I merely stated that they were Protestants; and I stated that I did not know whether Orangemen had extended so far; I spoke to the impression I had," &c. &c.

"Is your lordship aware of the fact, that the Orangemen were Churchmen at the institution of the order?"—"I have understood originally, that the Orangemen were composed of Churchmen," &c. &c.

"Does not your lordship think it improbable that Mr. Sparrow, your relative, the father of Col. Verner, and Dean Blacker, and those gentlemen would have become Orangemen themselves, if they had thought the Orange Association was properly to be declared a lawless banditti?"—"It certainly would be a very surprising thing if they did, after signing such a paper as that."

"Taking all these circumstances into consideration, and the fact that there never was an Orange Lodge in Ireland till September 1795, that the speech in question delivered by your lordship's father, was delivered in December 1795, three months after

the first Orange Lodge was formed, and considering that upon this occasion to the resolutions were affixed the signatures of the three gentlemen referred to, does not your lordship think the great probabilities are, that the reference by your lordship's father to this lawless banditti, must have been to the Peep-o'-day-Boys, and not to the Orange Institutions ?"—" I have stated, that I could not speak positively to the Peep-o'-day-Boys; my belief is, that it alluded to Protestants, but under what name or title they were, I cannot say."

" Is it probable, taking into consideration the circumstances referred to, that the reference could be to the Orange Institution ?" —" If so, there is a great inconsistency in it, certainly," &c. &c.

" Your lordship was pressed yesterday with a question, whether the persons who did this were not considered to be Orangemen; your lordship's answer was: 'I should think they were considered Orangemen ?'"—" *If I said they were considered Orangemen, I meant the violent Protestant party,*" &c. &c.

" What your lordship meant to convey was, that they were considered to be *Protestants* who had done this ?"—Yes, &c. &c.

" The fact is, that there was a great deal of commotion in Ireland in matters of this sort, and that the term was applied to persons who were not Orangemen at all ?"—" That may be the case."

" Do not people frequently impute transgressions supposed to be committed by Protestants to Orangemen, calling them the Orange faction ?"—" Yes."

Such is the testimony of Lord Gosford. There were religious feuds in Ulster previously to the formation of the Orange Society, which, by consolidating the power of those who desired peace, and engaging the most respectable of the people in the endeavour to maintain law, acted on the country not as a stimulus but a sedative.

(L.)—Page 37.

It has been established by the evidence of the Orangemen and their accusers, that up to the year 1796 the state of Ulster was a state of crime and disorder; that the Insurrection Act was called for especially, and in the first instance, by the disturbed condition

of Armagh; and that, through all the troubled years which have elapsed since the Legislative Union, the province of Ulster has been tranquil. It would be tedious to enumerate proofs; the reader is referred to the evidence reported by the Committee on Orangeism in Ireland, and especially to the testimonies of adversaries who, while they condemned the principle of the Orange Association, asserted in the most unequivocal terms, the tranquillity of Ulster.

(M).—Page 38.

It is remarkable that Wolfe Tone, in his journal of 1795, and in his Memorial to the French Directory, places his main reliance for the success of insurrection in Ireland, on the spirit and preparation of the organized inhabitants of Ulster. In the event of an invasion from France, "the North," he says, "would rise to a man." In subsequent passages from his journal, in the year 1798, when resident in France, he expresses his amazement at the supineness of Ulster, while the southern districts were in a flame. "What are they doing in Ulster?" is the gist of his question, and he appears totally unable to solve the difficulty. The explanation is evident. Much of the power acquired by the insurgent party, was owing to the insecurity of the country. When men were murdered, "because they had not the sign," many to whom the law could not extend protection, sought peace, and purchased protection from the party which had power to destroy life, and to save. When the Orange Institution held out a prospect of protection to those who maintained their allegiance to the crown, the offer was embraced; the well-affected became known to each other—the timid and the doubtful were soon brought to detach themselves from the lawless confederacy on which the emissary to France relied, and the change wrought through the influence of Orangeism in the north, marred the enterprise of the disaffected.

(N).—Page 38.

The select committee of the Irish Parliament, in 1798, and evidence taken during a recent parliamentary investigation exposed

the character of these calumnies. "Fabricated rules and tests" of the Orangemen were widely circulated—reports of projects undertaken by them against the peace and security of the country were propagated, and offences were perpetrated by persons disguised in such a manner, as to cast the odium of the crimes they committed on their unconscious adversaries. For a full account of the Orange Society, its views and organization, the lucid and eloquent articles in the Dublin University Magazine—"What is an Orangeman?" "An old Orangeman," &c. should be read. They cannot be read without deep interest.

(O).—Page 38.

The use made of the address of Lord Gosford, in 1795, is very characteristic. The following passage from an article in Blackwood's Magazine, for February, is not less instructive.

"Lord Gosford's admission, that Orangemen are frequently unjustly accused, had a remarkable fulfilment in a parliamentary paper produced and alluded to on the Committee before which his Lordship was examined. The paper is headed, 'Copy of the proceedings had at an investigation at Armagh, on the transactions which took place in that town and neighbourhood on the 15th of January last, and the following week, during which period several houses in that town were wrecked, and fourteen *Catholic houses!!!*'—(The reader may stare, but the words are so)—'Catholic houses burned in the neighbourhood by a body of Orangemen: together with the several papers connected therewith.' Such is the heading of these papers; and—*memorabile dictu*—we have entitled ourselves to speak by enduring the perusal of them—during the entire there is nothing which casts a shadow of suspicion on the Orangemen as concerned in the sacrilege upon the 'Catholic houses.' On the contrary, the only witnesses who spoke upon the subject with any distinctness swore, that they did not believe the parties who were engaged in the outrage to be Orangemen, and gave good reasons for their unbelief."—*Blackwood's Magazine.*

In a debate on Orange Lodges in the House of Commons, August 11, Colonel Verner, member for Armagh, exposed the

system of alternate blandishment and Billingsgate, by which the Orangemen of Ireland were persecuted. The facts adduced by the gallant member were of such moment, and were so frankly and forcibly stated, that it would be injustice to the subject not to cite them.

"The Hon. Member for the city of Dublin, had frequently boasted in that House and out of it, of having for five years labored to conciliate the Protestants; and, as it might appear, they obstinately rejected all his advances when he held out to them the hand of good-fellowship. He trusted the House would bear with him while he explained the objects and purposes of that honorable member, for seeking to bring about that conciliation, and leave to honorable members to judge whether the conduct of the Protestants was, or was not praiseworthy, in having resisted all the entreaties and all the efforts of that *consistent* member; he should first state to that House what was the conduct of that honorable member at a meeting, when he first began to practise the arts of conciliation; that statement was from a gentleman who had been present, and heard as well as saw what took place:—

"At a meeting in January, 1831, when he was in the glory of his agitation for a 'repeal of the Union,' the learned gentleman, after indulging in a long and violent harangue against 'Solomon Stanley,' and the other rulers of the day, proceeded to metamorphose the faction into 'his beloved Orange fellow-countrymen—the most noble, generous, and patriotic body of men any country ever saw;' and, continuing for a considerable time in this strain, concluded by praying with uplifted hands, 'that God and they might forgive him.' He then pulled down the Orange and Green banner which waved over his head, kissed the colors repeatedly and alternately—tore open his waistcoat, and pressed the Orange to his naked bosom, amidst loud and uproarious cheering."

"He should now proceed to read an extract from a letter addressed to the Protestants of Ireland, and dated 14th of December, 1833. He would beg to call the attention of the House to one passage in this letter—so different from the language made use of by that honorable gentleman in this House, more particularly

upon a recent occassion, when the noble Lord, the Secretary for Ireland, brought in the church bill. Upon that occasion, that honorable member observed, that 'he was glad something was likely to be done, at last, for the people of Ireland:'—

"'*To the Protestants of Ireland.*

"'December 14, 1833.

"'The British Parliament is incompetent, from ignorance, from prejudice, from want of sufficient interest, and even from want of time, to concoct and effect the measures necessary for the peace, security, tranquillity, and prosperity of Ireland. Will you then join us in our generous and patriotic efforts to procure the restoration of that parliament, which alone can be efficacious in producing all these blessings.'

"He then continues in the same letter:—

"'We have attained all we desired, political equality—you have nothing more to withhold from us. Accept the revelation in the spirit in which it is given—the spirit of Christian benevolence and universal charity, of conciliation, of peace, of perpetual harmony.

"'Even should you refuse, the Union will be repealed. The Catholics alone are seven millions at least. It will be impossible, quite impossible, that this nation should consent to leave its rights, liberties, and prosperity, in the hands and under the control of any, save Irishmen.'

"He then goes on to say—

"'If you Protestants co-operate for the repeal generously, honorably, and speedily, in twelve months we may have the Irish Parliament in College-green again.'

"And in a letter to Protestants, dated 10th January, 1834—

"'The repeal would be nearly valueless, unless the Protestants co-operated in the struggle to obtain it.'

"And he says—

"'But should the Protestants decline to co-operate in the repeal, yet the measure has, I now perceive, become inevitable. The Union cannot possibly continue much longer. Even without Protestant aid, it will be repealed. I go farther, and verily be-

lieve, that even against Protestant resistance, repeal will, in a very few years, be carried.'

"He should now beg the attention of the House to an extract from a letter, addressed to the people of Ireland, and dated 8th of April, 1834. By this time it would appear that he had begun to discover that the Protestants of Ireland were not so easily duped; and he expresses that a difficulty may occur in the province of Ulster—the Protestant province of Ireland. This letter was written previous to the measure of repeal coming before the House. He says—

"'*Letter to the People of Ireland.*

"'8th April, 1834.

"'Spring Rice and Luttrell Lambert will be followed and supported by some of the high Irish Protestant partisans. We shall then have Peel chiming chorus with Stanley, Lord Althorp playing second fiddle to Goulburn, Sir H. Inglis figuring at the head of English and Scotch Radicals; and the smaller fry of Whiggery and Toryism, in a shoal, swelling the majority into a mountain, in comparison to our mole-hill.

"'At present, no difficulty would be likely to occur, save in the province of Ulster.'

"A letter to the '*People of Ireland*' appeared, dated 25th of August, 1834, in which he says:—

"'For a long time I cherished a faint hope that the Orange faction might be conciliated to Ireland, and I have for some years acted on the plan of conciliation. I have exerted all my energies, and devoted all the resources of my mind to the endeavors to reconcile the Orangemen with the Irishmen. I acted with as much zeal as if I believed success attainable. I, however, scarce deceived myself by my hopes; and I am now and for ever convinced that Orangeism must be put down, or it will keep Ireland down without hope or without redemption.'

"The next document to which he would call the attention of the House, was an extract from a speech delivered by the honorable member, on the 10th of February, 1835, this year. By this time, it would be observed, that all hope of conciliating the Protestants,

as professed by the honorable member, had been abandoned, and he thus expresses himself:—'I have spent the last five years in fruitless endeavors to conciliate them; I thought to bring them over—but I might as well attempt to coax with success the sucking tiger or the full-grown lion.' So here they had it from the lips of the honorable gentleman, that it was not conciliation he sought, but, as he stated to the meeting, 'to bring them over;' and he would ask of the House to bear in mind for what purpose he wanted to bring them over. Was it not in order to aid him in bringing about a separation between the two countries? And what do those men deserve who stood true to their allegiance—who stood firm to the resolve of maintaining the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland—who had resisted every effort which the ingenuity of that honorable member could devise, during a period of five years, to accomplish this object—so much so, that he could not boast of having made one convert; of having got one individual Protestant in Ireland to disunite himself from his brethren in England? He should make no comment upon the manner in which that honorable gentleman expressed himself when convinced of his defeat, in a letter addressed to Lord Duncannon, upon the 30th of August. He should merely content himself with reading a portion of it to the House, and leave honorable members to form their own judgments upon it:—

"'*Letter to Lord Duncannon.*

"'30th August.

"'Their souls are so hardened in guilt, and so accustomed to the avowed desire of practical cruelty, that they do not affect to conceal their wishes to render Ireland once more a desert, and to irrigate her plains with the blood of her inhabitants.'

"Then, in a letter afterwards addressed to the People of Ireland, after saying, 'The Orange faction are, in point of intellect and understanding, the most deplorably degraded that ever excited the contempt or scorn of mankind,' he continues—

"'Then, as to their moral qualities, what are they? The preaching up of wholesale proscription, massacre and extermination; they call themselves Christians, they preach up doctrines almost

too bad for the eternal enemy of mankind to suggest to human depravity; bayonets and blood, form their texts and commentary. Their laymen vie with their parsons in ruthless atrocity, and it becomes doubtful which of the two are the more ready to preach rapine, murder, and desolation; the infernal spirit of religious persecution reigns over the whole, and renders the Irish Orangeists the most depraved as well as the most despicable of the human race.' "

The notions of justice must be rather peculiar in a parliament or a committee, which could exclude Colonel Verner as a partisan of the Orangemen, and admit such impartial judges as Messrs. O'Connell, Shiel, and Finn. The article in Blackwood's Magazine, to which reference has already been made, comments on this circumstance also.

"A passage from a speech of one of the members of the committee, Mr. O'Connell, was placed on evidence, which suggests another ground for exception than even religious prejudices. It is taken from a speech delivered by that gentleman to an association in Ireland, subsequently to the appointment of the committee, and to his having commenced acting as a member. After drawing a frightful picture of the condition of Ireland, and the almost intolerable sufferings of the people, he says, 'It is in such a state of things that the fell fiends of Orangeism exult. That infernal faction, gloating upon the vitals of the country, rejoice in seeing farms belonging to Popish inhabitants converted into sterile wastes, &c. &c. Such is the future prospect of Ireland from the Orange faction.' 'The Orange faction will not relax,' &c. &c. These passages are to be found in the evidence of the Rev. Mortimer O'Sullivan, delivered on the 26th of May. In such terms Mr. O'Connell, acting as a member of the committee, spoke of the party whose case he was trying. It does not appear that the notice of the committee was at all directed to them. It is certain that Mr. O'Connell did not feel it necessary to withdraw from the committee in consequence of having spoken them. It is also certain, that in the capacity of a judge or a juror, in a cause still pending, he could not have so prejudged the case. It remains to determine why Mr. O'Connell, having uttered such language, was permitted to retain his place in the committee, and

why Colonel Verner was excluded. We see no mode of accounting for the discrepant decisions except this, that 'the good old plan' sufficed the committee;—and the party which recognised Mr. O'Connell as their leader and the Orangemen as their adversaries, was the party which had 'the power.' It is right that the reader should be apprized of the circumstances. He will pass his own judgment upon them."

(P).—Page 39.

The reader is referred to the parliamentary investigation of the circumstances connected with this prosecution, held in the year 1833. A report was published of the proceedings, enriched with annotations and comments of the highest value, full of curious and important matter respecting the history and the condition of Ireland, written in a spirit of wisdom and moderation, with the minute knowledge of a native, and the disengagement of a disinterested observer. It is entitled "Debates, Evidence and Documents, &c.," and was published by Baldwin, Cradock, and Joy, 1823.

(Q).—Page 39.

This scorn however, has been mischievous. It is now well known, that the fabrication of calumny and the dispersion of false reports has become a system. One individual has been known to boast, that he was the paid decorator of reports, for parties who, after assaulting Protestants, contrived to have paragraphs inserted in the public prints, accusing their victims of having given them provocation. It was to him a matter of mere sport, from which he did not imagine any evil of magnitude could result. He however discovered his error and confessed it.

(R).—Page 41.

The reports of the Secret Committees in 1798, make mention of similar assemblages at that time, adopting various peaceful pretexts, but being designed for the purpose of ascertaining and exhibiting the force of the disaffected.

(S).—Page 44.

It is no more than justice to name some Roman Catholics, who took the view of this subject which was to have been expected from their individual character. Mr. Æneas M'Donnell, Mr. Devereux, and Mr. Waterton have placed their opinions on record. Mr. M'Donnell, in particular, has by his reasonings on the import and obligation of the oath reduced his most adventurous adversaries to silence. See page 191.

(T).—Page 49.

"When he (Earl Grey) came into the situation in which he then unworthily stood, and looked to the condition of Ireland, and the state of her government, and to the necessity of remedying existing and acknowledged evils, it seemed to him that a change in the office of Lord Chancellor was required. He did not mean to dispute the ability of Sir A. Hart, or his great legal acquirements; but it struck him, that it was absolutely indispensable, that the person to be connected with the new Lord Lieutenant as Lord Chancellor, ought to be a person in whose knowledge and judgment he could place the most unhesitating reliance. Looking round for an individual capable of affording such assistance, his eye rested at once upon Lord Plunkett. First, he thought Lord Plunkett was likely to conciliate the greatest number of persons; next, he seemed pre-eminently qualified, not only from his high legal acquirements, but from his general abilities and long political experience; and, thirdly, he was peculiarly eligible, because he had so long lived in Ireland and was so well acquainted with her situation, and with the feelings and interests of her varied population. If he turned his eye to the Roman Catholics, he knew that Lord Plunkett, as the most able and zealous advocate of their cause, was entitled to their confidence and affection, while the Protestants could feel no alarm lest their interests should be neglected by an individual, who, in all his exertions for the Roman Catholics, had never lost sight of the security of the Protestant church."

(U).—Page 52.

These notes have extended so far as to forbid any comments on the dismissal of Colonel Blacker. The following correspondence on the subject may suggest the appropriate reflections.

No. 1.

"Churchill, 2d Nov. 1833.

"My Lord,

"I understand Colonel Blacker, on the Report of the investigation held at Portadown, at which your Lordship presided, has been deprived of the commission of the peace. As the dismissal of so old and sō respectable a magistrate must naturally excite surprise, and create feelings of regret, as well as alarm in the minds of his friends and the magistracy of the county generally, more especially those who have been in the habit of acting with him, I trust your Lordship, as Lieutenant of the county, will pardon the liberty I take, in requesting to be informed upon what grounds it was considered expedient to have recourse to so strong a measure.

"I have the honor to be, &c.

"WILLIAM VERNER."

"The Earl of Gosford, &c."

No. 2.

"Gosford, 3d Nov. 1833.

"Sir,

"I MUST beg leave to decline complying with your application, as I confess I cannot see upon what principle I can be expected to afford any one, in his private capacity, official information respecting the causes that may influence government in the removal of a magistrate. I may however add, that the investigation to which you allude was public, and open to any one who wished to hear the evidence.

"I have the honor to be,

"GOSFORD,

"Lieutenant, County Armagh."

"Col. Verner, &c. &c."

No. 3.

"Churchill, Nov. 4th, 1833.

"Sir,

"FINDING that Colonel Blacker, on the Report of an investigation held at Portadown, on Saturday, the 19th of October, has been removed from the commission of the peace for the county Armagh, and that no cause has been assigned for his dismissal, I am induced, from the many years I have known and acted with that gentleman, and from the opportunities afforded me of witnessing the impartial manner in which he discharged the duties of that office, to request you will be so kind as to inform me, what act of magisterial delinquency he has committed which rendered it necessary for his Majesty's government to visit him with so strong a mark of its displeasure.

"I have the honor to be, &c. &c.

"WILLIAM VERNER."

"Right Hon. E. J. Littleton,
&c. &c. &c."

No. 4.

"Dublin Castle, Nov. 5th, 1833.

"Sir,

"With reference to your letter of yesterday's date, requesting to be informed what act of magisterial delinquency Colonel Blacker had committed, which rendered it necessary for his Majesty's government to visit him with so strong a mark of its displeasure as his removal from the commission of the peace, I am sorry that I cannot consistently with my duty make to you any other reply, than that I cannot acquiesce in the right of any individual in a private capacity to require from me an explanation of the discretion exercised by the Lord Lieutenant or the Lord Chancellor in the discharge of their public duty.

(Signed) "E. J. LITTLETON."

"To Col. Verner, &c. &c."

No. 5.

" Churchill, Nov. 6th, 1833.

" Sir,

" I HAVE been honored with your letter of the 5th inst. acquainting me that 'you cannot acquiesce in the right of any individual in a private capacity to require from you an explanation of the discretion exercised by the Lord Lieutenant or the Lord Chancellor, in the discharge of their public duty.' I beg leave to remind you that my request to be informed as to the cause of Colonel Blacker's dismissal from the commission of the peace, was made, not in a private capacity, but as a magistrate, having serious duties confided to him, and anxious to inform himself upon the best authority how he might most effectually discharge them.

" I regret much that you have not thought proper to comply with my request, and that my application to Lord Gosford, Lieutenant of the county, has been equally unavailing. I had hoped, that from a concern for the peace and interests of the country, government would be anxious to afford such information as I solicited; and would be desirous to render its examples salutary, and make its warnings understood, by showing at least equal readiness to expose offence, as to inflict heavy censure. I have been undeceived; and having in the instance of Colonel Blacker's dismissal, a proof that upright intentions, and the successful exercise of a sound discretion, cannot afford protection against complaint, or even secure to an accused individual the privilege of hearing his accusation, and making his defence; having, in the replies with which I have been honored, from the Lieutenant of the county and yourself, an intimation that a magistrate must not expect the assistance or direction of government in the difficulties by which he is surrounded, I feel that I have no resource but that of withdrawing from an office, in which I cannot conscientiously and honestly acquit myself in the discharge of duties, at all times arduous, but rendered doubly perilous at

the present day, by the severity and secrecy of government inquisitions. I therefore beg leave to resign my commission as a magistrate of the county of Armagh.

(Signed, &c. &c.) "WILLIAM VERNER."

"To the Right Hon. E. J. Littleton, &c. &c. &c."

ADDRESS III.

(A).—Page 61.

Mr. O'Connell's invectives against Mr. O'Sullivan have embraced no more than two topics. He had been a Roman Catholic; and the abbreviation of his prænomen, of which Mr. O'Connell approves, is not that which his friends have generally adopted. It would be doing the learned gentleman injustice to deny him the merit of perseverance in his frequent repetition of these grave charges. They have been his weapons for ten long years. In the year 1825, they constituted a reply to evidence given before a Parliamentary Committee. In 1834 they were the answer to a speech delivered in the Conservative Society in Dublin. In 1835 they were pronounced in Glasgow as a sufficient defence of Roman bishops in Ireland in the matter of Peter Dens; but no attention was paid to the proposition, that Mr. O'Connell might name any substitute or abridgment of Muiriertach or Moriertagh O'Sullivan, or as it appears in Irish story O'Suillebhawn, (the *O* by the way being a modern addition, as recent as the Crusades,) or in still earlier times "Uille," or, as it appears in Ptolemy's Map, Villebori" which he may prefer, to "Mortimer O'Sullivan," on certain specified conditions. The device of the Grecian to turn off attention from the habits of his life by mutilating his dog's tail, would not have succeeded, had Mr. O'Connell agitated at Athens. It does not tell well for the cause he had to support, or ill for the man he would defame, that he has contented himself with such topics of defence or crimination.

(B).—Page 62.

In the Appendix to Mr. Wyse's "History of the Catholic Association," the following passage occurs :—"1829, March 5. Bill of Relief then introduced. It abolishes all the civil disabilities on Roman Catholics by repealing the oaths of supremacy, abjuration, &c. &c., and substituting an oath of allegiance to the Protestant succession of the House of Brunswick, *binding the Catholics to defend the settlement of property as established by law, and not to injure or subvert the present church establishment.*" In the Political Catechism of the same learned author, published in the year 1829, the notion is combated, that Roman Catholics have any design to invade the temporalities of the church establishment. "Then Catholics are disposed to invade the temporalities of the established church, in favor of their own persuasion? Very far from it. There are many Catholics lay impropriators and in actual possession of those temporalities. There are many also, who, at this moment, enjoy the right of presentation to benefices. These men cannot be inclined to attack church property, for it is their own property."

No. But the mass of the people are not so situated? The Tithe-composition Act has transferred the payment of the clergy from the mass of the people to the landed aristocracy.

This, one would think, is sufficiently explicit. Roman Catholics are sworn to defend the settlement of property as established by law, and not to injure or subvert the church establishment. Mr. O'Connell in one of his addresses to the Volunteers, termed the oath an insult, and explained the sense in which he took it: "That oath refers to the settlement of property, as established by the law, and which can accordingly be altered by law." In his place in the House of Commons he held a different doctrine on the subject of oaths, a doctrine against which one Irish Roman Catholic member had the virtue to protest. That gentleman is no longer a representative. Of Mr. O'Connell's theory, it is needless now to speak. The exposure of it by Mr. M'Ghee called forth from a distinguished Roman Catholic gentleman, Mr. Devereux, an indignant appeal to Dr. Doyle, entreating him to assemble

the bishops of his church and condemn the perfidy, an appeal which, although it was unavailing is not likely to be forgotten. Some have contended that Mr. O'Connell's view is not so obviously faithless or absurd; that the swearing "to defend, &c., and the abjuring any intention to injure" may not shackle the liberty of one who opposes only legal hostility to the institutions to which he has promised and sworn forbearance. It seems very difficult to imagine that any sophistry can be more transparent, any falsehood more easily detected, yet it may perhaps be not out of place to observe, that the oath binds not merely to acquiescence in the settlement of property but to the defence of it; that the abjuration is not of any particular mode by which the church establishment could be injured, but of even the intention to do it harm. The man who swears that he renounces *any intention* to take his enemy's life, while he retains the intention to destroy by suborning false witnesses against him, or purposes to harass him to death by vexatious law-suits, would not get much credit for the ingenuity of his equivocation.

Mr. O'Connell, if he undertook the task of defending his conduct, should remember his speeches in the country as well as in parliament. "You all remember," he said, addressing the electors of Tralee, "when a Catholic could not go into parliament. I am now a member of parliament, and I am as fat, and as stout, and as merry as any Protestant among them. *The battle we are now to fight is to put down tithes for ever.* Will you allow yourselves to be fleeced by the parsons, who give you no value for your money? In the last session of parliament, I gave tithe a blow; *assisted by the other Catholic members,* we knocked off nearly two-fifths; and if the people of this town and county will stand by me on this occasion, I pledge myself that in the next session, *we will abolish them altogether.* I told you before what brought me here to-day. It was to oppose Orangemen and Tithes." These passages are found in the report of a speech delivered at Tralee, on Jan. 1, 1835. They are not more unequivocal than the deliberate expressions of epistolary communications, in one of which the concluding pledges are promises solemnly given by the writer, that he will never again voluntarily pay tithe or vestry-cess; and that he

will never purchase goods distrained for tithe. Let the heart of an honest man answer him—is the giving such advice and exhortation—is the proclaiming tithe the main object of hostility—the threatening with the death's head proscription all who will not join him in the war, consistent with Mr. O'Connell's obligations? is it keeping the oath, "I do swear, that I will defend to the utmost of my power, the settlement of property within this realm, as established by the laws, &c.?" Is that oath faithfully kept by one who exasperates the passions of the people against any species of property settled by law? It is unnecessary to make reference to the principle which has given to a recent confederation a still more decisive character; but it is not unreasonable to suppose that the fatal alliance has not been forgotten, and to ask whether ingenuity can devise any more creditable defence or explanation of the oath and its observance, than can be found in the volumes of Dens, and the canon of the Lateran Council?

(D).—Page 67.

The following extracts from the Atlas, will exhibit a rapid sketch of the character of these times.

"The Marquess of Anglesea's administration has commenced vigorously. He arrived on Thursday. Friday and Christmas-day were occupied in consulting the law-officers: the result, a proclamation prohibiting a meeting of the Trades' Union on Monday. Immediately after the proclamation appeared, there was a placard recommending obedience, and promising repeal, signed Daniel O'Connell."—*Atlas*, January 2, 1831.

"At the meeting for reform, held at Drogheda, Mr. O'Connell wore a green and orange ribbon, the Liberator's medal, &c. portrait of King William. The health of the Orangemen of Ireland was drunk in a bumper of Boyne Water, after which, the tune of the Boyne Water was played. On the other hand, the Orange Lodge has distinctly declared, that not one of its members has the most distant idea of co-operating with the Repealers. The number of sentries on the bank was doubled on Saturday night, and the same precaution is to be observed every night for the future."—Jan. 9, 1835.

"The Chancellor of the Exchequer said, that the hon. mem-

ber for Waterford (Mr. O'Connell) had excited the people to rebellion."—Feb. 13, 1831.

"Scarcely had the Lord Lieutenant entered the county Clare, when policemen, who had made prisoners of persons in the act of administering unlawful oaths, were murdered, and the five dead bodies were sent on cars to Ennis to be exhibited to His Excellency. The men had been stoned to death. The assizes commenced at Ennis on Thursday, but it was found impossible to muster a jury. The journey of the Lord Lieutenant from Ennis to Galway, was like a triumphal progress, multitudes crowding to meet him. He dismissed his military guard when he arrived at Mr. Lynche's."—April 17, 1831.

"A committee of Roman Catholic priests and other influential individuals appointed to consider the means of restoring to order the disorganized elements of society in Clare, have, in despair, dissolved themselves, and have recorded their determination of expressing to the Lord Lieutenant their firm conviction that the efforts of the well-disposed are too weak to combat the enemies of order."—May 1, 1831.

"A notice has been received by the Rev. Mr. Burch, a Roman Catholic priest, ordering him to be less energetic in his denunciations from the altar, against the disturbers of the public peace." —May 8, 1831.

"A poor man named Rice, had become obnoxious to the peasantry, and had come for safety to the town of Ennis. On the night of the 11th an immense party of the Terry Alts entered the town, proceeded to Rice's lodgings, within a pistol-shot of the barracks, and beat him to death with their spades. They have as yet eluded pursuit."—May 29, 1331.

"The lands of several gentlemen are abandoned by their owners and the servants, and Terry Alt or his men have them in full possession."—June 5, 1831.

"Special commission for Clare sat on Thursday at Ennis. Fourteen men were found guilty of administering an oath to the Rev. Oliver Grace, whom they roused from his bed at midnight, March 31, at the Glebe-house, Kilkrady, and swore to leave his glebe attwelve the next day." —June 12, 1831.

(E).—Page 67.

The words "secret societies" appeared in the first reports of the Address, having been copied inadvertently from the public papers; the correct term "select" is now supplied. It is the more necessary to notice the correction, in consequence of the reports which prevailed extensively, of Mr. O'Connell's having tendered information to the Irish government against O'Gorman Mahon, as a person engaged in treasonable practices. It was, therefore, no more than just to use terms which admitted that what that bold-spirited gentlemen did, he frankly avowed.

(F).—Page 69.

The letters to the Home Secretary, have been recently reprinted in the Standard for the purpose of suggesting a comparison between the advice given by Mr. O'Connell in 1834, and the measures now carrying into effect by the ministry.

ADDRESS IV.

(A).—Page 77.

The eloquence and authority of the noble and learned lords who seemed to have left their sphere, (and to whom the term, erratic might be more fitly applied than planetary,) when they availed themselves of opportunities to scatter as they travelled, diatribes against Irish Protestants and their church, do not appear to have been dangerously successful. It is somewhat strange, that those who hung with admiration on the tour of these eminent individuals, and who held itinerancy ennobled by their condescending to encounter its hardships and adventures, shall deny to humbler individuals permission to imitate their honored example. If men speak folly or falsehood, let them be exposed and stigmatized; if they are guilty of exaggeration, let them be convicted of it and censured; but if the solitary accusation against them be, that they have been received and heard by various assemblies of the people, the public will judge between the crime of speaking truth in the exposure of fraud or the defence of suffering virtue, in popular assemblies, and the merit of bearing false witness where person or place bestows a privilege.

But the public in some sense has pronounced a judgment. England and Scotland were tried by calumnies against the church in Ireland. That church will retain in grateful remembrance what the answer has been. The capital of Scotland heard the eloquent denunciation of the noble Earl.

[Here follows its reply.]

"The Address of the Bishops and Clergy of the Episcopal Church of Scotland, to their persecuted brethren in the Sister Island.

"To the Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy of that portion of the United Church of England and Ireland, which is by law established in Ireland:—

"We, the Bishops and Clergy of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland, during this dark hour of trouble and anguish to our sister church in Ireland, hasten to assure the bishops and pastors of that pure branch of Christ's Holy Catholic and Apostolical Church of the lively interest which we take in the sufferings of a body of men, on whose heads, through no fault of their own, the waters of affliction have been poured out.

"Being ourselves the descendants or successors of men who suffered long under unmerited persecution, we should indeed be undeserving of the rest which the Lord in these latter days hath given us, were we capable of beholding, without deep regret, similar persecutions directed against you; or of ceasing to present our supplications, by day and by night, to the divine head of the church, that it will please him, as far as may be consistent with his own glory and the church's good, to shorten the period of your trial. Yet are we not without grounds of consolation, in the midst of our anxiety on your account, when we behold the meekness and Christian fortitude with which your numerous tribulations are borne. By your patience, by your unwavering adherence to the cause of gospel truth, by your continued and faithful execution of the trust which our Common Master hath committed to your keeping, ye have deserved, and ye have earned the respect of the whole Christian world; nor can we doubt that He, in whose hands the issues of events repose, will at his own appointed season, reward your zeal and constancy by delivering you out of all your troubles.

"Brethren, it hath pleased divine Providence so to order our worldly matters that, except by our prayers which we offer up in your behalf, our ability to serve you is small, but the little which we can do, we will endeavour, God being our helper, to

do effectually. We have exhorted our several congregations to contribute, as far as their means will allow, towards the alleviation of your immediate distress, and we will transmit the amount of the collections thus made, with as little delay as possible, to your venerated Primate.

"Assuring you once more of our unfeigned sympathy, and beseeching you to pray for us that we may continue stedfast unto the end, we commend you to the keeping of Him who is abundantly able to save, and who, according to his own most gracious promise, will never permit the gates of hell to prevail against the church which was founded in his own blood, and of which ye are the faithful ministers and stewards.

"Given at Stirling, this 29th day of December, in the year of Our Lord, 1835, and signed by the authority, and in the names of all the bishops and clergy, by me,

"GEORGE GLEIG, L.L. D.

"Bishop of Buchan and Wremus."

Such were the terms in which the dignity and worth of Edinburgh (for in the spirit which dictated it, the church of Scotland participated) communed with an afflicted church. Munificent contributions accompanied the noble and affecting address. The reply of His Grace the Lord Primate is subjoined.

"To the Right Rev. the Bishops, and the Rev. the Clergy, of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Scotland.

"My Right Rev. and Rev. Brethren,

"Your affectionate and truly Christian address to the Archbishops, Bishops, and Pastors of that portion of the United Church established in Ireland, having been transmitted to me by your venerable bishop and primus, it becomes my welcome duty to convey to you, in our common name, the expression of our most lively gratitude and esteem for the generous sympathy which the privations and distresses of the Irish clergy have excited in your bosoms. If not sufferers yourselves, at least successors of those who have suffered for conscience sake, and inheritors of their unshaken constancy and unfailing charity, you will, above all

men, be able to appreciate the comfort and encouragement which this seasonable proof of your fellow-feeling is calculated to impart. With pride and exultation do we acknowledge your claim to be accounted one with us in doctrine, in worship, and in discipline; in all, in short, that constitutes and adorns a true and apostolic member of Christ's Holy Catholic church. The evils brought upon the ministers of the Irish branch of the United Church by a sudden and almost total suspension of income, entailing pecuniary embarrassments of the severest kind, and the disappointment of well-founded hopes by harassing and combined opposition to legal claims; by personal insecurity and actual outrage—by expulsion from their parishes and the destitution of their families—by unceasing clamour and the most unjust accusations—are far greater than can be represented in any general exposition of suffering. By none better than yourselves will the nature and extent of those sufferings be understood. The liberal contributions from every quarter of the United Empire, unexpected in their amount, and never sufficiently to be acknowledged on account of the Christian spirit in which they have been made, will suffice, I trust, to administer a temporary relief; but the injuries inflicted upon present incumbents of parishes are too deep to be repaired by any act of private benevolence, however munificent. The rich consolation of a religion pure and undefiled—the consciousness of having done their duty in patience and forbearance—the approbation of their Christian brethren—the hope of their acceptance by their Heavenly Master; things beyond all price,—remain to the Irish clergy, and animate them to persevere in that course, which, through the grace of God, they have been hitherto enabled to pursue. Nor is it one of the least of our consolations to know, that amidst those diversities of opinion, which have rent, and are still rending Christ's kingdom on earth, there has been preserved a sister church in Scotland, holding with us the faith, as it was once delivered to the saints, and abiding in that pure form of ecclesiastical polity which was consecrated by apostolical institution. May that church continue to be a pattern to ourselves in all Christian graces. Like it may we be found faithful amidst the greatest discouragements, in all things

pertaining to our common ministry. My brethren in Christ, permit me to repeat to you with no ordinary feelings of affection, our cordial thanks for your solicitude on our behalf, and for your contributions in relief of our temporal wants. We humbly pray, and we desire your prayers in conjunction with our own, that, in the inscrutable way of God's providence, his name may be glorified on earth, and gospel truth illustrated and more firmly established in the hearts of men by our afflictions. With sentiments of the most sincere regard, I subscribe myself

"Your faithful friend and servant,

"JOHN G. ARMAGH."

(B).—Page 80.

The Chief Justice (Bushe), who represents the disorders of Ireland as results of a "mysterious system," which has for sixty years, baffled the attempts of legislation to eradicate it, and who describes the people as under a two-fold process of demoralization, in their adherence to illegal oaths, and their scorn of oaths tendered in the administration of justice, who speaks in language so pregnant with warning of the frequent associations by which the terror of the evil-doer is rendered powerful—is the same chief justice who, according to Mr. Moore, may be said, because of his incorruptible judgment, to wear without inconvenience, as an ornament merely, Moran's fabled collar. The language of Baron Smith is equally instructive with that of his learned brother. The progress of disorganization or revolution in Ireland, can be accurately determined by the changed estimation it has accomplished of the characters of public men. There was a time when Baron Smith was as much applauded and admired for his assertion of liberal principles, as for the

"high philosophy,
Wit, eloquence and poesy,"

with which it was his felicity to adorn every subject he touched. The gifted judge is what he was in the days of his renown, but he is as much averse from democratic licentiousness and from Papal intolerance, as he ever was from what he thought restraints on the freedom of opinion. Therefore, the authorities

who ordered his speeches to be printed for the edification of the people, were required by the demagogue to prosecute him, because he had made them.

(C).—Page 81.

Some have doubted the truth of the many reports which have described the contumely to which the Bible has been condemned, by Romish priests in Ireland. The cases, however, which have been made matter of parliamentary debate or of judicial decision, cannot be doubted. Dr. Doyle's eulogy of the man, who took the Bible in a pair of tongs and buried it; the petition presented by Mr. Shaw, occasioned by the conduct of a priest who forced a poor dying girl to surrender a Bible or Testament which she had kept in secret and read by stealth—and burned it;—a petition signed by six hundred persons in the King's County where the sacrilege and the tyranny was paraded; and the recent decision in the county of Cork, where a priest was convicted of assaulting a man, whose sole offence it was that he read the Bible, are sufficient, (and they are only specimens of a class of outrages,) to make the conduct of priestly despotism and the unhappy condition of its "subjects" sufficiently known. It is not fanciful to suppose that the depreciation of the Protestant Bible abates the reverence for an oath, as administered in courts of justice. It is well known, that there are books in Ireland on which it is believed the most practised perjurer would not swear falsely; and instances have occurred in which acknowledgments have been given, that an oath on a Protestant Bible was not sacred.

(D).—Page 82.

The various and extensive nomenclature of the systematic disturbers in Ireland, was attended with many advantages. The adoption of a new name was regarded by surface politicians as equivalent to the demise of an old system; and the continuity of insurrection seemed interrupted. Had it been in the thoughts of politicians that, since the year 1760, a system of insurrection has been in operation in Ireland, and that the variety of names to which it had recourse, were designed for the purpose of extend-

ing its influence and evading suspicion, they would have been more watchful. Many recruits were gained to the great confederacy, through the machinery of local associations. To be a Caravat or a Shanavest, seemed "to come by nature,"—once introduced into the porch, to be admitted, if thought worthy, into the more esoteric society was matter of easy arrangement.

(E).—Page 84.

The passage in Mr. Boyton's speech here alluded to, as found in the newspaper reports, is as follows:—

"With regard to the continuity of possession, I would wish to observe that it is utterly untrue that the property of the Roman Catholic church of Ireland was ever transferred to the Protestant church. In the reign of Henry II. he transferred an independent church to the supremacy of the see of Rome. This is a case where the state corrupted the doctrine, and transferred the supremacy of the national church. In the reign of Henry the Eighth the reverse process was adopted, for in that reign the state reformed the doctrine, and resumed the supremacy of the national church—a proceeding to which all the great lords of Ireland, with by far the larger majority of the prelates and the clergy, most fully assented. In proof of this, I shall trouble you with the following extract:—

"'Of the nineteen prelates assembled in the reign of Elizabeth, in a parliament held by the Earl of Sussex, January, 1560—two only (Welsh of Meath, and Leverus of Kildare) refused to renounce the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff. The consequence was, that for many years there were no Popish bishops in Ireland, and when they did make their appearance, it was in the character of rebel chieftains rather than of Christian prelates. Maganran, titular Archbishop of Armagh, was sent over from Spain, and killed in the act of rebellion against his sovereign—and in 1621, as O'Sullivan informs us, there were but two Popish bishops in Ireland, and two others who resided in Spain. These persons, to say nothing of their political character, were at best merely missionaries from the Pope, ordained in foreign countries, who did not even pretend to trace their ordinations to the ancient

Church of Ireland. The orthodox and undoubted Protestant bishops of Great Britain and Ireland, are therefore 'the only persons who in any manner, whether by ordination or possession, can prove their descent from the ancient saints and bishops of these islands.' It is a positive fact that they and they alone can trace their ordinations from Peter and Paul. No Popish bishops can by any possibility trace their spiritual descent by ordination from the original pastors of our churches; for their line of succession began at Rome scarcely more than two centuries ago, and none of them have ever received ordination from any British or Irish bishops descended from the ancient line of prelates, who for so many ages have represented the apostles in these realms. These facts are sufficient to prove that the orthodox bishops in possession are really the true, the apostolical minister of God.'"

To this clear and able argument it may be added from Bramhall, p. 62—"Both our universities, after long deliberation, made this final resolution and profession—'Tandem in hanc sententium unanimiter convenimus ac concordes fuimus, videlicet, Romanum episcopum majorem aliquam jurisdictionem non habere sibi a Deo collatam in Sacra Scriptura in Hoc Regno Angliæ quam alium quemvis externum Episcopum.'"—*Sacr. Syn. An.* 1530—1532.

Here is an unanimous resolution and declaration, that the bishop of Rome has not conferred on him by God in holy Scripture a greater authority in England than any other foreign bishop. The following passage also is worthy of perusal. "The act for no person to be cited out of his own diocese, the act prohibiting all appeals from England to Rome, the act for payment of first fruits to the crown, an act for exoneration from all exactions of the Church of Rome, the act declaring the King to be supreme head of the Church of England, an act against Popish bulls, faculties, and dispensations, and the act for utterly extinguishing the usurped authority of the Roman bishop, were all, or the most of them, enacted before the eight-and-twentieth year of Henry VIII. And if my notes fail me not, (*for we are chased from our books,*) they were all received and established in Ireland in the same year, the Lord Grey being then Lord Deputy of

Ireland. All this while, there were no thoughts of any reformation. All this while, the Protestants found little grace from King Henry, nor indeed, throughout his whole reign, ordinarily." —*Bramhall*, p. 62.

(F).—Page 87.

Lord Plunkett has recently complained that a five years' trial of his education scheme was not sufficient. Mr. Shiel has affirmed that the trial of the measure of 1829, has been, as yet, too short. Why is the church to be denied the benefit of a similar plea? and why do not those who advocated "emancipation" as the purchase of an opportunity to obtain a hearing—(those who said that if laws of exclusion were withdrawn, Roman Catholics would join the church,) vindicate their consistency by insisting that the trial which the church is to have must be fair and free; that she must not be exhibited in an humiliating attitude—be represented as in a precarious condition, and be cripled in her exertions, while at the same time she is undergoing a judgment as to her success in making converts.

(G).—Page 89.

It is scarcely necessary to prove that the Protestant clergy in Ireland did not provoke animosity by volunteering their controversial exertions. From the day in which Dr. Hussey traced out the plan of education at Maynooth, provision was made for spreading the doctrines of Romanism. Mr. Colquhoun's admirable speech has placed the character of that institution in a point of view which renders it unnecessary to add a word in aggravation. He has exhibited also the machinery and the influences by which it pervaded Irish society. No delusion can be grosser than of those who imagine that Popery would have been quiescent in Ireland, if it had remained unopposed. It would be just as reasonable to say, that he who discovers, causes a fire. Popery would bide its time for display;—but, while concealed, it would not be idle. By dating the commencement of Protestant controversy, in the year 1834, Dr. Doyle showed that the replies and remonstrances which his own conduct and writings had provoked,

were the arguments to which he especially alluded. A passage from one of the pamphlets which the " vindication" of the Right Rev. Divine provoked, will give an idea of the feelings in which his exertions were contemplated. In order to understand the reasonableness of Protestant alarm, at a time when the population of Ireland was agitated by reports of miracles, and when masses of men in thousands and tens of thousands were congregated in a state of preternatural excitement, it should be remembered that the miracles were performed in 1823, and 1825, which according to Pastorini, were to deliver Ireland from heresy. It is not uncharitable now to imagine that a design of no trivial character lurked behind the wonders. The eloquent pamphlet alluded to— " Observations on the Vindication of J. K. L.," comments thus on the parsimony of miracles, with which the incredulity of Ireland was complimented.

" I have now disposed of most of the topics upon which J. K. L. has thought it necessary to enlarge in his tirade against the established clergy. But what will be the surprise of the reader when, after all this, he lays claim to the character of a man of peace! and expects to receive much credit for the degree in which he and his reverend brethren have been instrumental in tranquillizing the minds of the people. The proof which he gives of this is singular. He has forborne, he says, from motives of peace, to publish *other undoubted miracles! ! !* This is good. But why, we may reverently ask, were they performed? He tells us in another place, *that no miracles are to be attended to unless sanctioned by the authority of the bishop.* And he withholds his sanction, forsooth, from motives of peace, from what he believes to be the most signal attestation which Almighty God can give to the truth of his religion! Where would Christianity be at the present day if the apostles had acted on this principle? Miracles are performed, but they are not to be credited! God speaks in thunder, but the people are commanded to stop their ears!—This is certainly carrying a love of peace to an extreme, for which J. K. L. cannot be accused in any other part of his pamphlet. How must Lord Wellesley feel flattered and obliged by having the honor of God thus postponed to the convenience of his ad-

ministration! How grateful should the Protestants feel for this considerate suppression of what they must have felt as the death warrant of their system! But how is J. K. L. to excuse himself *to good Catholics* for all this? Come, come; he is too hard upon himself. He is not so bad, by one half, as he would make himself appear. For although he has withheld his sanction from the miracles, he has not abated one particle of the hostility with which he regards the heretical establishment against which they are directed. Nor can he be fairly charged with diminishing, in any undue degree, the rapacity and the vengeance of its enemies, when he misrepresents the nature of its property, when he misrepresents its amount, when he misrepresents its effects upon agriculture, when he misrepresents its effects upon society, and represents the law by which it is secured, 'as wanting the essential conditions of a law,' and as opposed to the laws of God and nature; and describes its clergy as wretches, who are marring all the efforts of the gentry to improve, enrich, and harmonize the country; and says, that murders and atrocities, which would 'for ever stain the character of the nation, harden its heart and brutalize its feeling, are occasioned or committed by their agents!!!' When, while sedition is raging in the south, Dr. Doyle thus unfurls the oriflam, and pronounces what amounts, virtually, to a benediction on the insurgents, the very worst enemies of the church, will, I think, forgive him for '*for having suppressed the other undoubted miracles.*'"

(H).—Page 89.

It has been studiously represented that the Roman Catholic people were averse from religious controversy. The contrary is the fact—they crowded to discussions: and the Rev. Mr. O'Conner, a clergyman of the Church of Rome, declared before a Parliamentary Committee, that his people were angry with the priests for not meeting Captain Gordon in argument. Various instances of a similar character could be mentioned.

(I).—Page 90.

The masterly exposures, by the Lord Bishop of Exeter, of the

vices of this system, render it a pleasing duty to imitate the example of the patrons of these schools, who were subdued into silence by his Lordship's late memorable speech. Of the system, it is now confessed that

"Things bad begun strengthen themselves by ill."

(K).—Page 91.

According to ministerial anticipations, the Church Temporalities' Fund was to be available for purposes demanding an annual outlay of at least 279,000*l.* The utmost to which it was expected ever to amount, at an unascertained distance of time, was 150,000*l.*

CHURCH TEMPORALITIES' FUND.

Dr.		Cr.
To Ecclesiastical purposes....£135,000 To repaying Bonus to Landlords 140,000 Interest on Loan..... 4,000	Per An.	By a hope of income, amounting, at some remote time, to.....£150,000
279,000		
150,000		
To Balance.....£129,000		

One part of the ministerial project was calculated to prove successful. There would have been an evident necessity for the creation of a surplus. The mode of producing it is now understood—"Convey, the wise it call." A parochial clergyman of the highest class, whose parishioners exceed three thousand, and who has, as many in such circumstances find necessary, the assistance of *two curates,* is to have a salary of 500*l.* per annum. To disengage him also, from all cares which might obstruct his *missionary* labors, he is to be made a farmer. The proposers of this spoliation set a fearful precedent. The "omnipotence" of parliament may be found inconvenient, when men have delivered evil "instructions, which being set, return to plague the inventors."

(L).—Page 99.

The interruption here was occasioned by the simultaneous

rising of the whole assembly, who continued cheering for some minutes.

(M).—Page 99.

A gentleman on the platform had kindly corrected the speaker, by suggesting the form of expression—Church of England in Ireland.

(N).—Page 100.

Returns had been received from various parts of the country in which tithes were in process of being freely paid, at the time when Lord Althorp was induced to make his ill-judged or ill-designed declaration. It is unnecessary, and might be invidious now, to say more than that numerous complaints were made, authenticated by the signatures of most upright men, that, immediately after the noble Lord's declaration, the payment of tithe was discontinued, although, previously, the debt for tithe had been in process of rapid liquidation.

(O).—Page 101.

It would seem as if all calculations founded on the supposed character of the Irish clergy, were based on insufficient data. A day will come when the unostentatious endurance of these much wronged men shall be known. It is a painful but a sublime spectacle to witness the stedfastness of their adherence to principle, exhibited under the severest trials. They have not, speaking humanly, been unfaithful to their trust or unworthy of the suffering, to which, for reasons which may at no remote day be understood, they have been subjected. They have not betrayed the church. Had they selfish objects to seek or serve, they might well have exempted themselves from affliction, by sacrificing the cause for which they suffered. They sought a better kingdom. The spirit in which in various declarations they express their thankfulness for measures which protected the sacred institutions in which they ministered, although leaving them in affliction, cannot be too highly praised. One address is selected, not for its superior excellency, but because of the circumstances of the clergy who subscribed it.

"To the Most Reverend Father in God, John George, by Divine Providence, Lord Archbishop of Armagh, and Primate of all Ireland.

"May it please your Grace,

"We, the Clergy of the Diocess of Ferns, feel that we should be wanting in duty to our church, not less than to your Grace, if we did not come forward at this crisis, to offer our tribute of respect and gratitude for the services which your Grace has rendered during the past eventful year.

"We beg to express to your Grace our cordial approbation of the resistance which your Grace made during the last session of Parliament, to the measures introduced with respect to the Irish branch of the United Church, and to declare our readiness to submit to any privations, however great, rather than assent to a scheme fraught with such disastrous consequences to all that we hold dear as Christians and as Ministers of the Gospel. We have borne for some years severe and disheartening sufferings; but we trust the Divine assistance will enable us to persevere, in resisting the temptation to barter for present ease and comfort, the interests of true religion; and we beg to assure your Grace of our zealous co-operation in any measures that may be deemed necessary for preserving to succeeding generations, the fabric of our Apostolic Church, whole and uninjured.

"It has been industriously circulated, that our resistance to the measures of spoliation arose from unworthy subserviency to the Bishop that was then set over us. That venerated Prelate is now no more—and to your Grace we need not defend his memory from the charge of exacting such a compliance. We have already expressed to our new Diocesan our scorn at the charge, and assured him that our opposition was the spontaneous dictate of our own sense of duty.

"We must now advert to another subject—a subject on which we well know your Grace would command silence, but which is so deeply imprinted on our hearts, as to imperatively call for our warmest expressions of gratitude. We must not omit any opportunity of recording our thanks for the anxious solicitude with

which your Grace has laboured to alleviate the distress of the Clergy in Ireland, and for the splendid munificence which has marked your Grace's own contributions. While we offer these heartfelt thanks in common with all our brethren, we feel that we owe a peculiar debt of gratitude to your Grace; and as none have suffered more deeply, so none have experienced a greater share of your Grace's protection.

"That the Almighty may long preserve your Grace to watch over the interests of this Church, is the sincere prayer of your Grace's faithful humble servants."

"To the Clergy of the Diocess of Ferns.

"My Reverend Brethren,

"I HAVE received your affectionate Address, (signed, I believe, by every clergyman of the diocess) in approval of my past exertions, with not less lively feelings of satisfaction and of honest pride, than have been excited in my bosom by similar communications from other bodies of the clergy.

"After these multiplied assurances of entire concurrence with me as to the mischievous tendency of the measure introduced in the last session of parliament, it is no longer permitted me to doubt of the soundness of my own opinions, nor of the course which I am hereafter to pursue. Your professed readiness to endure a continuance of the most severe privations rather than barter, for present ease and comfort, the interests of true religion, is worthy of yourselves and of the cause to which you are devoted; and I should feel it to be unnecessary, if not unbecoming, to add a single word in vindication of your motives in resisting the intended spoliation, were not the prompt and manly expression of your sentiments on that occasion, connected with a subject which painfully forces itself upon my mind. To the memory of your late revered and ever-to-be-regretted Diocesan, I cannot, then, refrain from joining my feeble tribute of respect with your own. Firm and independent in his own nature, he was incapable of tampering with the independence of others. I am proud to say, that enjoying his intimate confidence, and

profiting by his profound wisdom and enlarged views, I have acted with him in this and in almost every other measure affecting the welfare of the Church, in the strictest unity of counsel and accordance of sentiment.

"No one, therefore, is better qualified than myself, to bear testimony to his devoted attachment to that Church, the maintenance of which was inseparably united in his mind with the advancement of Christian truth. Hence his uncompromising opposition to the invasion of its rights and property, and to every plausible project of innovation, the present advantage of which, when purchased at the risk of ultimate subversion, he suffered not for a moment to enter into his consideration. It is not however, necessary for me to bring to your remembrance these characteristic qualities of this distinguished Prelate, by the example of whose primitive virtues, and unshaken constancy, your own conduct has been directed. But it remains for me, in common with yourselves, to lament the irreparable loss we have all sustained, in being suddenly bereft, at a time of the Church's greatest need, of the talents and experience of one of the most upright and able supporters of the Church's cause that has been raised up in these latter days; the cause, as we believe it to be, of the Protestant faith in Ireland. I pass over, as in brevity I am forced to do, the other subjects of your address; grateful to me, no doubt, is your approval, but proportioned rather, as my conviction suggests, to your partiality than to my deservings.

"May the God of patience and consolation grant us still to be like-minded one towards another, according to Christ Jesus; and be it our united prayer, that he will be pleased to direct our counsels, and to bless our humble endeavours for the promotion of his glory and the spiritual good of those committed to our care.

"I remain, my Reverend Brethren,

"Your affectionate friend and servant,

"JOHN G. ARMAGH."

The following address was forwarded from the Clergy of the diocess in which the Rev. Irwine Whitty, and the Rev. Mr. Young, were murdered.

"To His Grace the Lord Primate of all Ireland.

"We the Clergy of the Diocess of Cashel, feel imperatively called upon to address your Grace, and to unite with our brethren of the different Dioceses that have already come forward in expressing the highest approbation of your dignified, zealous, and straightforward defence of our deeply assailed and afflicted Church.

"We find it impossible adequately to convey to your Grace the high sense we entertain of the wise and consistent course you have hitherto pursued amidst difficulties the most distressing and perplexing; and we place implicit confidence in Almighty God, the Saviour and Head of the Church, that by the aid and guidance of his Holy Spirit, he will enable you to persevere in a line of conduct so beneficial to the best interests of religion, and that all the members of our venerable and Apostolic Church may be encouraged by your example, meekly yet earnestly to 'contend for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.'

"It has, we regret to say, been imputed to the Clergy that in the course they adopted on a late momentous occasion, they were guided by the influence of their spiritual superiors rather than by sound Christian principle. For ourselves, we utterly deny this ungrounded statement, and feel it a duty we owe to our respected Diocesan, as well as to ourselves, to declare, that no such influence was exercised, but that we acted freely, and according to our own judgment.

"And although we feel ourselves bound by the highest authority, the written Word of God, to yield a ready obedience to the laws of our country, yet we declare our unalterable resolution to endure the severest privations rather than by any sanction or act of ours to weaken or undermine that venerable fabric which, 'built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone,' and in the preservation of which the temporal and eternal welfare of the people of this country is, as we feel persuaded, most deeply concerned

" May God grant you a long continuance of life and strength, that ' following after righteousness, godliness, faith, love, patience, and meekness, you may fight the good fight of faith, and lay hold on eternal life,' through Jesus Christ our Lord.—Amen."

" To the Clergy of the Diocess of Cashel and Emly.

" I scarcely need assure you, my reverend brethren, that the Address which you have been pleased to transmit to me, expressive of your approbation of the course I have pursued, with the concurrence of your own Diocesan, in defence of our common cause, is at once a source of the highest consolation to me, and, proceeding from such a quarter, a most satisfactory confirmation of the justness of my own views. It has pleased Almighty God to call me to the responsible situation which I hold, in times abounding with difficulties, as you but too truly characterize them, the most distressing and the most perplexing; and I deeply feel that mere rectitude of intention, whatever charitable allowance it may be entitled to on the score of human infirmity, will not be deemed an adequate defence for striking errors of judgment, in a question which involves matters of the highest concern to the spiritual and temporal welfare of men. Never could I have satisfied myself with the conscious purpose alone of doing well, if, in the judgment of the Irish Clergy, I had surrendered the rights of the Church through want of firmness, or endangered her security by the rashness of my counsels. But, in accordance with the sentiments of your brethren in other Dioceses, you have generously stepped forward to relieve your Bishops from a part of that responsibility which pressed heavily upon them, by identifying yourselves with them in their opposition to the measures recently proposed in Parliament. It was possible for you to have sheltered yourselves from the blame now heaped upon us under the plan insidiously suggested to you, of having been unduly influenced by episcopal authority, and, in the midst of the most grievous calamity, to let the insinuation go unanswered, that you have been made unwilling sufferers, contrary to the dictates of your judgment and conscience. Your devotedness to the cause of Christ is worthy of better times; and if I may indulge the

hope, that the clouds now hanging over the Established Church in this country will be, by God's goodness, dispersed, and a brighter day arrive, it is founded under the conviction of his overruling providence on the Christian constancy, the unity of purpose, and the sympathy of affection which pervade all ranks of the Irish Clergy.

"And now, my brethren, having done what, in an honest conscience, and to the best of our judgment, we felt ourselves bound to do, let us cheerfully commit the issue to the disposal of Almighty God, praying ever to the Throne of Grace, that as ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God, we may be found faithful, which is the part required of us by our Heavenly Master.

"I beg to subscribe myself your faithful friend and servant,

"JOHN G. ARMAGH."

"Armagh, Dec. 17, 1835."

Such is the reply of the suffering Irish clergy to the calumnies of those who said that they were dissatisfied with the conduct observed by their friends in parliament, and by their noble head. The addresses are selected from bodies of clergy who were altogether withdrawn from the influence of the Lord Primate; and addresses similar in spirit and character were presented to that exalted personage, from almost every Diocess in Ireland. They ought to be collected and published in a permanent form. A day may come when their interest will be greatly enhanced, and even now, they would do service by doing honor to the cause which is sustained with so Christian a spirit.

(P).—Page 102.

The surplus is now provided by a somewhat different process from that which was last year to procure it. The gift to the Roman Catholics and the landlords was then to be obtained by the extinction of public worship. Now it is to be wrung from the personal comforts of the clergy, or rather, it is to be obtained by the simple process of converting the clergy into farmers.

ADDRESS V.

(A).—Page 109.

These reformers professed to confine themselves to the revenues of the church alone, leaving matters of doctrine and discipline to Protestant regulation. They did not, however, abstain from endeavours to regulate ecclesiastical appointment. Mr. O'Connell considered himself and the country wronged by the elevation of Dr. Kyle to the bishopric of Cork, and complained of the wrong in one of his admonitions to the government. Such interference, it is not too much to say, implies an invasion of church freedom, and threatens its purity of doctrine. Let Mr. O'Connell select bishops for the church in England or Ireland, and exclude such bishops as Doctor Kyle, and he may safely leave matters of doctrine to their fate.

(B).—Page 111.

A very discreditable endeavour has been made to lessen the value of such professions and pledges, or rather, to excuse the violation of them. Had emancipation been granted earlier, said Dr. Doyle, we should have kept our promises. But, at the time when the claims were granted, Roman Catholics *swore* that they would keep the promises of which some now excuse the violation. Every year from 1807 to 1829 it might be said that they pledged themselves to refrain from assaults on church property. In 1829 they confirmed these promises by a solemn oath, and it is rather too much now to say, that the oath and the promises should have been held worthless because they had not been at an earlier date rewarded.

(C).—Page 112.

It would seem properly to form part of the duty assigned to the Commissioners of Education to ascertain the truth of this assertion. It was, surely, a question of some moment to discover who they were on whom the burden of maintaining the Protestant church rested. In the absence of such returns as might have been furnished by the Commissioners, there is no other evidence than that of parochial reports and general notoriety, according to which Protestants are proprietors in the proportion of twenty to one. This indeed is confessed by Roman Catholics who claim only to be considered as having mortgages to an indefinite extent. Mr. Boyton in his admirable speech had shown, that the proportions in which the members of each church are benefactors to the public charities, were, even in Dublin, as more than twenty to one in favor of Protestant bounty, while as regarded persons relieved, the proportion should be inverted.

"There is another topic to which I feel myself constrained to advert, and I should not do so, were it not that such persevering attempts are continually made to misrepresent the subject to which my statement refers, and exhibit us to England in the light of extortioners. I allude to the nature and extent of the public charities, which are supported, I assert, all but exclusively, by the Protestants of Ireland. I have been stating for the last two years the proposition I am asserting now; and mark, I never have been contradicted—often have I repeated it, never has it been denied, though perhaps you will now hear of it for the first time. I shall take some of the returns of these charities just at random, and show the relative amount contributed towards their support by Protestants and Roman Catholics. In the year 1829 a collection was made for the distressed manufacturers, when there was contributed

By Protestants, ... 3,554*l.* 10*s.* 10½*d.*
Roman Catholics, ... 192*l.* 13*s.* 9*d.*

The next is the largest Roman Catholic contribution I have seen proportionably—

In the Protestant churches, ... 1,045*l.* 4*s.* 2*d.*
Roman Catholic chapels, ... 336*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.*

You are aware that in Ireland we have no system of poor laws; and that our poor in Dublin obtain partial relief in the Mendicity Association. To the institution the proportion which the subscriptions bore were, in 1833,.

Contributed by Protestants ..... 4,455*l.* 18*s.* 2*d.*
„ by Roman Catholics .. 408*l.* 5*s.* 0*d.*

But you will, perhaps, suppose that a much greater number of Protestants were relieved by the institution than of Roman Catholics. To prevent any error, I have a return which shows the relative number relieved by the Society, and I find it as follows:—

Roman Catholics 1,846
Protestants 150

We have in Dublin a Fever Hospital, considerable in extent, though, of course, not upon the same scale of magnificence in which such an institution would be founded in this country—for what country, in munificent liberality, where want or suffering was concerned, could compete with England? But still our Cork-street Fever Hospital is of some extent, as you may judge from the number of persons relieved in it. The amount contributed to the support of the institution is—

By Protestants ..... 368*l.* 8*s.* 7*d.*
By Roman Catholics ..... 10*l.* 18*s.* 0*d.*

But you will probably imagine that this institution is solely for the relief of Protestants. The number of patients admitted to the hospital is 3,991, and the Roman Catholics are in proportion to the Protestants as 10 to 1. We have also an institution in Meath-street—the 'Sick Poor Institution;' to the support of which there is contributed—

By Protestants ..... 176*l.* 17*s.* 1*d.*
By Roman Catholics ..... 10*l.* 1*s.* 0*d.*

and the proportion of Protestants relieved were to the Roman Catholics as 1 to 20. There was another institution, the value of which could scarcely be appreciated—medical men may know

its vast reputation—I mean the Lying-in Hospital. The sum contributed in support of this institution, from its foundation up to the year 1827, was—

By Protestants..... 35,503*l.* 2*s.* 1*d.*
By Roman Catholics 157*l.* 10*s.* 0*d.*;

and the patients admitted were—

Protestants..... 17,242
Roman Catholics 103,452

These are facts of much importance, and which should be borne in mind, when the Protestants are charged with being an overpaid church, and with being insensible to the wants and distresses of their Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen. The same proportion holds universally in the whole country. I have had numberless returns from every quarter in Ireland, and they all tell the same tale. The public charities are supported exclusively by the Irish Protestants; and, let me say, this is no unimportant duty to discharge, in a country where there are no poor laws."

(D).—Page 116.

The Rev. Robert M'Ghee has discovered that this condemned and disowned book, was after the disclaimer republished in Cork, authenticated with episcopal signatures of, and announced as for sale to *subscribers only* to whom *it* was to be conveyed by *proper persons* in every town. Dr. Murray answers this charge by professing himself ignorant of the existence of the book. When some intelligible canon of interpretation can be agreed on, the force of the Right Rev. Divine's disavowal will be understood. In the meantime, receiving his assurance as if equivocation were not tolerated in his communion, what can be said in behalf of the three thousand Irish ecclesiastics of his church who must have supposed either that the book contained nothing contrary to their profession, or that it was not their concern to prevent the people from reading pernicious precepts, or to protect their superior against the misrepresentation and the obloquy to which the abuse of his name necessarily exposed him.

(E).—Page 121.

The announcement of this condescension on the part of a Protestant government was made through the public prints by a Roman Catholic priest. It was an observation of the archbishop of Canterbury, that the persecutions of Protestants in Ireland resembled those of the early Christians, which arose principally out of the violence of the people and the neglect of government. In the case of Mr. Synge, his house, in a certain sense, continues his castle. The government does not invade it. He is simply told, that if he shelter a Scripture-reader he shall not have protection; he is left to conjecture what the people will do when it is told them that protection is withdrawn. It is said that within five or six years, eight hundred persons have suffered because of their daring to read the Scriptures to auditors, upon whom it is plain the word cannot and dare not have been forced. What a subject for reflection.

(F).—Page 124.

Repeated proofs have been afforded, that the priesthood of the church of Rome desired to have such a census undertaken and represented it to their people as intended for their benefit.—*Digest of Evidence of* 1824, 1825, vol. i. 61. The following passage contains matter worthy of grave consideration. Its eloquence is not the only merit it possesses.

"Go, number the people! Report how many belong to the established church, that an excuse may be afforded for seizing on its revenues. Report, also, how many are in the open profession of the popish religion, that the liberality of the legislature may be evinced in extending to it a larger measure of parliamentary support. Can the men who countenance such proceedings be designated otherwise than as the enemies of all righteousness? We ask those who know the state of the country at the present moment, could any more effectual expedient be devised for making our peasantry say among themselves 'This is the heir, come let us kill him, that the inheritance may be ours.'"

Dublin University Mag. August 1834.

ADDRESS VI.

(A).—Page 130.

These demands would grow, in all probability, with the successes which encouraged them. In one of his letters, Mr. O'Connell confesses that although he had at one time thought existing rights should be respected, he has begun to entertain a different opinion. Economical reflections of this kind would not in all probability become liberalized by an opportunity to put them to practice. The assurance given by the honorable and learned member to his friends, that he accepted an instalment of tithe with a full purpose of abolishing the whole system, is not likely to be forgotten.

(B).—Page 130.

The testimonies in both houses of parliament were too numerous, and of too great weight, by which the closeness of the connexion between outrage and agitation was shown, to need citation. The following spirited passage marks out, with graphical precision, and with a minute knowledge of the subject, the mutual dependency of the departments of disorder—or, more correctly—the necessity according to which crime originates in a system of agitation which excites the humbler classes to discontent and anger.

"Talk of the protection of the law, where if a Protestant

farmer, together with his family, should escape the wholesale destruction of the midnight conflagration, he has still to sustain the houghing of his cattle, the turning up of his lea ground, the levelling of his fences, the firing of his turf-stack, the ferocious assaults upon himself or his children, when returning from the fair, or the market; or, if he should escape these, has yet to endure what the poor fellow himself calls 'the more wearing and break down' annoyance, arising from exclusive dealing, and the various other petty devices suggested by a mean and malignant bigotry. There could be no doubt (though attempts have been made to disguise the fact) as to the cause of all those horrifying atrocities. * * * *

"It surely is not very difficult to prove this to those who have ears to hear. When the peasantry of a country are taught to believe that though not *de facto* they are *de jure* the possessors of the soil—when they are told that some centuries ago their forefathers were robbed by a band of foreign invaders, who have ever since kept them in a state of unequalled slavery—that their pure and holy religion was denounced by those invaders, who planted their own execrable heresy in its stead. * * *

"He at once becomes an idler, a vagabond, a drunkard. He thinks no more of going home to the bosom of his family after his day of healthful and useful labor; he goes to the shebeen to hear the last new speech of the 'Counsellor' read by the head schoolmaster; (a gentleman of whose multiplied accomplishments even Lord Brougham, with all his 'march-of-intellect perfectibility' has but little notion.) His earnings soon go in drinking potations pottle deep 'to the Liberator's health, and the first gem of the sea.' Rent-day comes round: all the money has disappeared. It has gone either, as we have just said, in drinking to the 'Counsellor's' health, or again, to pay his share of the only rent he has been taught to acknowledge, viz. the tribute necessary for keeping the 'Counsellor' in parliament, while removed at such a cruel distance from the wife of his bosom and his 'callow nestlings of domestic bliss;' or again—for this modern minotaur quite distances the ancient in the variety of his swallow for the public tribute—it has gone to fee the 'Counsellor' for undertak-

ing the defence of some brother Whiteboy, who is entitled to the eternal gratitude of his country for freeing them from such monsters as Parson Whitty."—*Dublin University Magazine.*

(C).—Page 139.

Among the many instances of true zeal for the interests of the church and religion, may be recited the sedulous and successful endeavours of the Bishop of Down and Connor, Dr. Mant, to procure the necessary powers from parliament for breaking up two or three preferments of very great value, by which he might have, had it pleased him, enriched sons or near relations, but which he employed for the benefit of his church by the preferment of eleven curates.

(D).—Page 142.

Mr. Boyton proved, with admirable clearness and strength of reasoning, that in the same proportion as the church became relieved from extreme poverty it became efficient. He showed that the progress of improvement was rapid towards the close of the last century, but subsequently to the Union had been extremely gratifying. The number of glebe-houses, churches, and schools, he showed had been marvellously increased, and the increase in the number of scholars such as to gratify the most sanguine.

"You have already seen that previously to our union with you, the Irish church had, to speak in homely phrase, no fair play—and let me now proceed to show what she has done since her connexion with the church of England. The number of churches in Ireland were—

In 1762.....	543
1792.....	643
1800.....	687
1829.....	1307

Including ninety-nine which were enlarged. Thus you perceive that from the period of our connexion with you until the year 1829 more churches were built than had previously existed in the country, and there are at present in the diocess of Armagh more churches than in the reign of George the Third were in all

Ireland. And more than that, I can assure you that these churches are filled with sound, loyal, religious, and educated Protestants, brought up to fear God, honor the King, and obey and support the law—reared in love to their church, and attachment to the constitution and government of England. Allow me now to allude to another subject. Previously to our union with you there was in Ireland but one institution for scriptural education, and that was founded by the laity and clergy of the established church, in which it was intended that Protestant children should be educated. This was, mark you, the only institution which at the time existed in Ireland. It was named "The Society for Discountenancing Vice." Periodical examinations were held by this society generally in the churches, from which it appears that the number of individuals attending its examinations were, on an average,

From the year 1800.....	707
In the year 1829 there were.....	30,000

Well, before the union there was no school but the parochial schools, supported by the Protestant clergy. But subsequent to the union, in the year 1829, look at the difference. There were then superintended by, or in immediate connexion with the clergy,

Association schools, having	20,000	scholars
Sunday schools	185,000	—
Kildare Place Society.....	137,000	—
	342,639	scholars."

The following extracts from Parliamentary returns are also worthy of attention. Acts of Parliament were passed to promote the building of churches, &c. &c. in 1806 and 1815.

From 1787 to 1806 inclusive, under the old law—	
Churches built by gift from the F. F. Board	102
Glebe-houses to which the Board gave a gratuity of 100*l*...	41
Total under the old acts.....	143

Under the new law from 1806 to 1833 inclusive—

Churches built	728
Ditto enlarged	141
Total.....	869
Houses built	600
Glebes purchased	202
	802
Total of churches, houses, and glebes	1671

There are still wanted, at least, the following numbers—

Glebes for benefices and perpetual curacies	400
Glebe houses for ditto	500
Churches wanted for benefices and perpetual curacies	100

(E).—Page 145.

None of these cases, or indeed of any in the addresses, are imaginary.

(F).—Page 145.

The letter alluded to, notwithstanding the entreaty that it should be held confidential, and the intimation that " no man's life was safe who was known to have complained," was given up for publication with the name and address of the writer.

(G).—Page 151.

It is said that within the last year, there has been an increase of crime, and that for seven hundred murders committed in that county within the last three years, there have not been more than twenty capital convictions. This is only rumor, but it is certain that the disproportion between the commission of offence and the infliction of legal punishment, is extreme. When the writer of this note was a boy, he remembers a heap of stones in the vicinity of the assize-town of Tipperary, Clonmel, which each shuddering passer-by increased by a new contribution. The heap commemorated a murder—the name or soubriquet of the

victim abides in the writer's memory, because of the circumstance which gave the crime its especial character. It was not that there was any thing of unusual atrocity in the offence. It was that this murder was named as (with a single remote and uncertain exception) the solitary instance *in which the perpetrator had escaped the penalty of his crime.* What a contrast to this liberal and enlightened time.

(H).—Page 152.

There was something of more than ordinary cruelty in that contrivance by which Lord Grey was expelled from power, arranging, that the laws to protect peaceable men in Ireland, should be postponed for the convenience of political parties in Great Britain. Such has long been the fatal policy pursued towards seven millions of people, among whom crime is left unchecked, and life insecure, until it shall please parties in England who are scrambling for place, to adjust their differences. And yet the advantage of a legislative union is strongly insisted on. Proof is offered; and the proof is, that Ireland has become wealthier since, and in consequence of her close connections with Great Britain. Wealthier? The cause is abandoned which can have recourse to such a defence. What are the moral consequences of the Union? No attempt has been made to procure an answer. "There has been on the part of Parliament since the Union, (whatever Mr. O'Connell may assert,) no want of attention to the state of Ireland. There is no one subject which has occupied one tenth part of the attention of the various governments during that period, and of the two Houses of Parliament. Thirty-three committees of parliament, twenty-one government commissions have enquired into it, and reports from the most practical men have been received, &c. &c. all of these committees and commissions have given their attention to what one may call the *material* instead of the *moral* state of Ireland."

This is the distinction, observed by Mr. Colquhoun, in his late admirable pamphlets on Ireland, tracts rich in various and valuable information, and written in a spirit of intelligence and impartiality becoming the importance of the subject. His

objection is, as he says, "not to the *votes*, but the *views* of Parliament," not to the endeavours made to improve the details of Irish government, domestic and general, but to the expectation that such improvements are to ensure moral good. If there arise in England, before the legislative union has been repealed, a party wise enough to know the importance of "doing justice to Ireland;" wise enough also to know the value of honesty—and having power to make its wisdom available, there will be commissions and committees of a different character, and instituted with a different design. The moral estate of Ireland will be made the subject of grave consideration. The police will be required to furnish monthly reports of the homicides committed in every district, stating the names and residences of the victims, and the circumstances of the crime. These reports will be made public, that they may be subjected to the correction of all parties, whose local knowlege enables them to add to the reports or to diminish from them. There will be enquiries to ascertain whether the reproaches uttered against the majority of the Irish people are true, and what are the real causes of their demoralization—whether or why they think murder an honorable vengeance, and the prosecution of an assassin an unpardonable crime—whether it is true that they have no value for oaths administered in a court of justice, and what is the explanation of the irregularity, &c. &c. In short, if there be in England before it is too late, a party strong enough to render wisdom available, and wise and honest enough to make a good use of power, the moral condition of Ireland will be thoroughly examined and exposed, and order and good morals, and security for life and possession, will be found not to be of necessity attendant upon increasing wealth. The lives and even the souls of men will be thought of not less consequence than roads and canals and harbours, and the truth that "Righteousness exalteth a nation—and that sin is a reproach to any people," will not be despised although it has a scriptural authority.

THE END.

Joseph Rickerby, Printer, Sherbourn Lane.